NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VII.---NO. 43. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1847. WHOLE NUMBER 355.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY.
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. N. HENRY, PRINTER.

Communications.

LETTER FROM JONATHAN WALKER.

PLYMOUTH, March 3d, 1847.

FRIEND S. H. GAY:—I recollect that a little more than a year and a half ago, on my way to my family from the land of whips, paddles, and chains;—where I had been caged up for nearly one year as a strange animal, whose pacific or ferocious disposition was a puzzle to the women-scourgers and baby-traders there; and was finally turned adrift as a kind of scape-goat, with the mark of the beast, and the curses of the slave-mongers bestowed upon me as a sort of baptism;—I called at your office, 142 Nassau street, New-York city, and before I left, you requested me to "furnish an occasional article for the Standard." My objection was, my inability, in consequence of not having the benefit of an education. Were it otherwise with me, I should have been glad to have contributed something to the columns of the "Standard." Had I the faculty of transferring my thoughts and experience intelligibly and connectedly upon paper, it is very probable that I might have furnished your readers with an occasional article, instructive and interesting, both on the subject of chattel Slavery on shore, and despotic Slavery on shipboard, or in the various marine departments. In many cases, for the time being, the sailor's condition is but a little, if any, removed from that of the chattel slave under the driver's lash; and in some respects, have no more efficient means of obtaining redress for wrongs and outrages committed on them, than the chattel slaves in South Carolina, or Georgia, where their only safety and protection consists in being the recognized property of their owners. But I propose only giving a sketch of my Anti-Slavery experience, since I had the satisfaction of meeting yourself and several other friends of humanity at the time and place above mentioned.

I had scarcely returned to my family when I received pressing invitations from various quarters, and numerous friends of the slave, to come among them, or go forth and preach the Anti-Slavery gospel. Feeling that my experience, and a simple statements of the facts which came under my knowledge [illegible] with some well disposed persons to cast in my mite for God's poor; and from that time to the present, have devoted nearly my whole time and energy to the cause; and, in fact, have gone beyond my means and ability, and shall probably, as a case of necessity, for the present relinquish the field—not the cause, however.

The first four or five months, I travelled in company with Loring Moody, in Massachusetts, who has since been the general agent of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society. I was then sustained by the liberality of a few friends and small collections taken up occasionally to defray expenses, &c. But for the last year nearly all I have received has been what little profit I could derive from the sale of Anti-Slavery publications, and in many instances it was not sufficient to defray my travelling expenses, although I have been as economical as circumstances would admit of. I have held meetings in four of the New-England States, and in more than a hundred different towns, but have spent most of the time in Massachusetts. I Have held meetings in places where the first Anti-Slavery man could not be found, and many towns where the third one was unknown.* I have been over much ground where no faithful Anti-Slavery labour had been done, no good seed sown, and the consequence is, nothing of the right spirit has sprung up to bear good fruit. But party briers and sectarian thorns were in all places deep rooted, shooting forth their malignant points at everything which came in contact with them. But I have seen a few spots where the radicals had been throwing in their reformatory firebrands, which caused some crackling and stir among the trash, and finally cleared away a few breathing holes for humanity.

I have been into places where no suitable house could be obtained for a meeting; at other places have had to wait on several Committees, be questioned in respect to *isms*, &c. and refused; and at other places, procured some public or private hall, posted up my notices, lighted the house at my own expense, or paid for the use of it; then have had to go to a rum house for lodging. I will here cite one instance as analagous to a number of others. "I gave notice in the "Hampshire Herald," (a Liberty party paper,) that I would be at Greenfield at such a time, (some ten days after,) requesting "the friends of the slave and of humanity, to make the necessary arrangement for a meeting," &c. Knowing that a number of the Heralds were taken there I took no other steps until I arrived, late in the day appointed for the meeting. I inquired if anything had been done, and found there had not. There was no other meeting in the place to interfere; and there were two empty halls, and four or five meeting-houses; none had been applied for. It was then too late in the day to give notice for a meeting that evening. I made arrangements for a future time, passed on to other places to fulfill other appointments, and returned at the set time, talked to some sort of an audience an hour and a quarter, sold one dollar's worth of books, gave away one and a half dollar's worth more, paid for the use of the hall, and went to a *James K. Polk* grog tavern to get clear of sleeping in a snow bank. This was at a large thriving village in old Massachusetts, ATE, *a hot-bed of abolition.*

I have dispensed with taking up contributions at meetings, except to pay for the use of the house, &c.; don't think it a good plan—get but little except from the Anti-Slavery folks, and they can give without a contribution: it produces more talk than money. People don't want to pay to have their errors exposed—they are not willing to buy the truth for truth's sake. All parties and sects want exceptions made—they are not so bad as others—anxious to shift the blame on their neighbours—the Abolitionists,—on the South, &c. &c. It is not good for the speaker to think of getting pay of the audience when lecturing to them—places him in a wrong position—an inducement to leave out some important truths—had better feel under no pecuniary obligations at such times.

I left home last fall, and have been with my family but three weeks since; and that happened in consequence of ill-health: my lungs gave out, could not talk, tedious cough, &c. I am much better now, and intend to make another trial in a day or two, for a month or so, then retire, for a time at least, having more than two reasons for doing so.

What the result of my feeble efforts will be I never expect to know here, but if any good comes of it God be praised for that. I get my reward as I go along, in having the satisfaction of knowing that I go to the extent of my ability for the benefit of the oppressed.

But one thing is certain; I have induced many people to talk and read on the subject, which has been one grand object with me. It is the lethargy, the indifference, which prevails in community, which I dread much more than the open and zealous advocates of Slavery. All the licentious bribe of slave-breeders and female polluters of the South, with John C. Calhoun at their head, are not half so terrible to me, as are the cringing, time-serving, and hypocritical politicians and religionists of the North, whose hinges are always on the squeak in turning to the nod, whines, or dictation of the speculators of their own species, and the croakings of their agents, the lawyers and priests, (*demagogues,*) who claim to have the key of knowledge, but have no disposition to do right, and those that would, would hinder.

Woe unto you lawyers and priests, "hypocrites," *double tongued vipers,* "who put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter, light for darkness and darkness for light." When righteous judgment shall visit you, "to whom will ye fly for help, and where will ye leave your glory?" The poor, the ignorant, the degraded, the oppressed, and the brutalized have a fearful account with you. Are you prepared to meet it? Will your pampered ease, your sumptuous fare, your sanctimonious performances one day in seven offset the guilt for which your responsible situation and your conduct makes you accountable? Decorate your show houses, carpet and cushion your synagogues, make long prayers to the war-God, talk learnedly about Palestine, the [illegible] Abraham, David, and Soloman, call often on the congregation to lend to the *Lord* money to forward the missionary cause, to build and furnish large houses, and sustain officers who favour poligamy, concubinage, and Slavery, and send others to foreign countries to civilize and Christianize those whom they need to teach them humanity; make eloquent the extension and perpetuation of the system of adultery, robbery, rape, and murder, but what will such acts and devotions avail you when placed by the side of the lamentations of the poor, the cries of the orphan, the sighsof the prisoners, the wail of the widow, the lacerated backs, and prostituted chastity of the slaves, and the groans of the mutilated and dying, by brutal violence, which you have been aiding to bring about? Woe! woe! to ye propagators and sustainers of such deeds and abominations! "What will ye do in the day of visitation?"

From long and careful observation, I am compelled to believe, that the cause of the slave and humanity has nothing good to expect from any of the party or sect-leaders, or their adherents, in their present position. I speak advisedly, and therefore sincerely and candidly insist on all the friends of the victims of oppression, for their own sake, for injured humanity's sake, and for righteousness' sake, to see to it, that the guilt is rolled from their own doors by a faithful discharge of their own duties; and not neglect to do what they can, because they cannot do what they want, or wish to do. If we cannot wall the whole city, let us put that part over against our own house. If we can't labour abroad, let us work at home—talk the subject over candidly, deliberately, and impassionately, with our acquaintances, neighbours, associates, and families. Get them to examine it, question them on the subject, and see that they have the means of information, such as suitable reading matter, &c. I flatter myself that I have done much in that way, although my means have been very limited. I have seen the good fruits of it, which serves as a stimulus to further exertions. The last year I have disposed of four or five thousand Anti-Slavery publications; and have no doubt but I have done much more for the cause by that means than by any other. It has also been the main pecuniary support of myself and large family, though the profits were small. The urgent demands on my purse brings me considerably in arrears. But we have had up to this time sufficient bread, and pure water in abundance from the never failing spring, which is more than thousands of others have in this boasted land of equality, Democracy, and Christianity.

Yours for impartial freedom and right,

JONATHAN WALKER.

*By their fruits ye shall know them. If they are ready to do as much for the removal of Slavery as they are to sustain it, I call them Anti-Slavery.

CAZENOVIA ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

[CONTINUED.]

Mr. Hathaway continued: Is this Government pro-slavery in principle or practice? Then it is not a "*civil Government.*" We do not go against civil governments or voting. But we go against this Government for the very reason that it never has been, neither now is, a civil government.

Civil Government is that which protects the rights of all men, and if it comes short of this, it is not a civil Government. It is a voluntary association, which is constituted to protect rights, not confer them. A civil code must have an equal respect to the rights of all men; the weakest, the poorest, and most obscure of the poor. If it allows the rights of any one to be outraged, it affords no protection for any, and is not municipal law. We ought to come up to the full and perfect understanding of this principle. We must consider the character of the times when the Constitution was framed, the character of the framers, their relation to Slavery, and their avowed designs, in connection with the latter, to arrive at the character of that instrument. It was a bargain, a bond. A promise has been defined to be that which the "promisor understood the promisee to understand at the time the promise was made." The Northmen understood the Southmen to understand that they gave "Slavery' solemn guarantees," at the time the Constitution was made. The three-fifths representation had special and particular reference to slaves. If I were to describe this meeting, by enumerating all the men and their children held to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all other persons, of course, I should be understood to mean women, though the word women I did not mention. Remember, a majority of the Convention were slaveholders, and that Slavery existed in all the States save old Massachusetts; and how can we expect that an anti-slavery instrument should emanate from such a source. They framed that instrument with that monster system staring them full in the face; yea, their own hands were full of blood. Why, the very fact that the word slave or slave-trade, (which then existed,) is not in the Constitution, is strong evidence of its pro-slavery character. Does any man presume to deny that the first clause in section ninth, had reference to the Slave-Trade? It is just as explicit as if the words slave-trade were in it. Now bear in mind, (for confusion appears to have taken hold of several men of late respecting this clause, even of Gerrit Smith,) this clause says it shall not cease prior to the year 1808, and does not say it shall after that time. Can that be called anti-slavery? Was it anti-slavery during the twenty years? with no power to repeal it before 1808!

If it was designed to be anti-slavery after that time why did not every slave shackle fall, at the brightness of its anti-slavery letter and spirit?

Who first proposed the prohibition of that "*piracy?* The Southrons! For what? To make their domestic piracy more profitable! Suppose Mexico should be annexed to this country, and Congress should feel that it might be for the interest of the nation to accommodate the South, and should repeal their act prohibiting the foreign Slave-Trade—what becomes of the anti-slavery of that clause then?

Mr. Bishop interrogated friend H. "Do you repudiate all documents that are wrongly construed?" Mr. H. replied no. I said if it was anti-slavery. It had from its origin been trampled on, and is practically null and void; "nothing but the shadow of a great name," and if the spirit of the association, was so wicked as to frustrate it, I became equally wicked while I remained in the Union.

Mr. Bishop. Suppose it was right in letter and spirit, and was the rule of conduct of the Government, then would you support it? How can the Constitution guarantee to each State a republican form of Government if it is not anti-slavery?

Mr. Hathaway. I would support such a Government. That which receives its power from the consent of the governed. (Query, "Is our Church pro-slavery?") What did the term signify as expressed in the Constitution by its framers? That which allowed the people in the States to hold slaves, otherwise, you make the framers of that instrument base liars. Why should any State wish for the guarantee of the Slave-Trade, if no State could hold slaves [illegible] All the States, with their slaves and slave laws, were admitted at that time, with what the Constitution meant in its guarantee to them of a republican form of Government.

There is no spirit of freedom in the Government. When has freedom and humanity derived any benefit from this Government? Union! what union has the friend of freedom, but with the lash, prison-walls, the branding-iron, and the gallows, in this Government? The copartnership is unholy and grossly wicked; in it, Slavery has increased from seven hundred thousand to three millions.

Mr. Bishop. What do you propose to do? form a new Government?

Mr. Hathaway—Yes.

Mr. Bishop. May it not become corrupted? Mr. H. Yes. Mr. B. What will you then do, come out? Mr. H. Yes. Mr. B. You will be all the while out of gear I'm afraid.

Mr. Hathaway. Well, then, "get out of gear," get out of all union with wrong-doers, throw yourself upon the arm of Almighty God, be a true man.—"Get out of gear!" we are all out of gear now, and we are trying to get into gear.

How long would you remain in "gear" with that Government that should throw your daughter into the brutal hands of a vile debauchee, and send Gen. Taylor to butcher innocent women, to enable the Southrons to enlarge their harem, within the area of this Government? A slaveholding public opinion sent Gen. Taylor down to Mexico to kill the Mexicans, the *same proscriptive* spirit sent Freeman down to the Van Ness family!

A friend inquires how his church is implicated? In precisely the same manner that the members of a temperance society would be implicated, (though united for the ostensible purpose of abolishing intemperance,) who continue at the same time in union with rum-makers, rum-sellers, and rum-drinkers, and pledge them support, and a seven-fold influence in their society, at the expense of the widows, the orphans—made so by the traffic. The members of this church continue in this slaveholding Union, hand in hand with slaveholders, who trample the heart and hopes of the slave into the dust. If my wife was in Slavery, do you think I would go and join myself with her holders, and legislate with them for her freedom or protection, or for the protection of human rights?

Now, somebody's wife and children are in Slavery—Christ's sister and God's children; and are we to continue in union with impious men, who steal them and keep them, to legislate with them? This church fellowships those who vote for, and legislate with men-stealers. No man can vote under this Constitution, without performing a pro-slavery act, of necessity.

Mr. T. Borden. If Mr. Hathaway's position be correct, he is pro-slavery so long as he lives in these United States. He denied that he fellowshipped slaveholders in his union with them. Though in union with them, Liberty men protest against the evil. May we not continue in union with slaveholders, and meet with them on the same platform, if we protest against their conduct. If not, then we incur guilt if we stop to talk with a drunkard in the streets.

Mr. Hathaway remarked that we had natural relations and artifical or conventional. I sustain a natural relation to the drunkard and the slaveholder; but that was altogether a different relation and position from that where I enter into a voluntary association or union with him while a slaveholder, and give him seven times the greater influence and power, because he is a slaveholder. I sustain no such sinful relation in remaining in this country; there was a wide difference between being the Government and being governed—between a king and his subject.

Mr. Borden. Mr. H. can't live in this world, and be an innocent man. It is not necessary that we endorse slaveholders because we unite with them in governmental action.

Mr. Remond said he discovered the difficulty in the minds of our opponents; they made no distinction between our natural relations and responsibilities and voluntary associations in wrong-doing, and the guilt which attached itself to every individual that associates himself with evil-doers. A protest amounts to nothing, so long as he continues in fellowship with those who persist in evil-doing. The members of this church are in a slaveholding Government, giving it their voluntary support. Birney, Jay, Sewall, and many other Liberty party men, admit the Constitution to be pro-slavery; and yet, Liberty party men, at one moment, swear they will support it, and the next, talk about the laws of God, and natural justice, which they are going to be governed by.

Every voting member of this church unites with the Calhouns and McDuffies, in swearing to support a slaveholding Constitution.

J. G. Birney, in Michigan, helped to reject coloured men from a Liberty party Convention, because their right to vote was not recognized by that State Government. What would he do for the slave if elected to the Presidential Chair.

Mr. A. B. Murch said, that according to our views we were pro-slavery, if we made use of the post-office, or paid duties on goods.

E. D. Hudson remarked, that did not necessarily follow. It was right for him to write letters to his family, to employ even a wicked man to carry them, and pay him an equivalent for the service rendered him. He did not support, or give countenance to the man's wickedness in so doing; he employed him to do an act right in itself; the whole transaction was in no respect wrong. Thus it was when he employed the United States mail; he confederated with no man or body of men to support any immoral Government or system in so doing. Furthermore, it was right for him to exchange the products of his labour with his brethren, the world over, for the products of their labour; and because Liberty party men stand on Boston wharf—in the person of their agent—the officer of the robber Government,—and rob him of one-fourth or one-half of his property, that did not involve him in any way in the guilt of the Government. The Government was not his, he had borne his living testimony against it, by with-

C. L. Remond said there was no parallel in his paying the Government to carry a letter for him, and going and uniting with the Government; swear "to support, protect, and defend it," and thereby help keep his brethren in slavery. He was not opposed to the Government as a non-resistant. Let my man lay hands upon me, and attempt to enslave me, and that fact would soon become public The Government does not protect my rights, and I will not support such a Government. Show me a constitution which protects the rights of all men and I'll sustain that.

Evening Session.—Joseph C. Hathaway commenced the session, by presenting the National Anti-Slavry Standard, as an interesting, able, and efficient instrument in furthering our cause, which was a knife between truth and falsehood. This question is one which is now convulsing our Federal and State Legislative bodies, and shaking all of our ecclesiatical bodies to their foundation, and will continue to do so, until freedom triumphs, or Slavery succeeds in palsying her tongue. Every advantage which Slavery obtains in the world, is at the expense of the life-blood of freedom. Just so far as error triumphs, truth fails—Slavery versus humanity.

C. L. Remond, thereupon, commenced the further discussion of the resolution on the Constitution and Disunion, premising some remarks on the origin of Liberty party—*that it originated in deception.*" Several voices crying, *false, false.* Whereupon, C. L. Remond moved that the resolutions, then under discussion, be laid upon the table, for that evening, and that the *origin of the Liberty party* should be the subject for discussion this evening.

R. Thomas, Esq. a Whig lawyer, very respectfully suggested that the resolution on the Constitution should be laid on the table indefinitely, for two reasons. He should be sorry to have that community adopt it, and he entertained so much respect for those who had so earnestly advocated it, that he should feel sorry to have them mortified by a defeat. He thought the sentiment of the resolution of doubtful expediency at least.

Mr. Thomas was challenged to take the negative on the resolution, the next day, to which he reluctantly assented, if the audience wished to have him act as its attorney. He regarded the Union in the same light that Washington did—too sacred to be called in question: and if his assenting to take the negative, implied the right to agitate the question, he should decline. If he was drawn into the discussion, the audience must shoulder the responsibility.

Mr. Remond's motion was adopted, and the origin of the Liberty party made the order of the meeting. Mr. Remond remarked that it had been truly said by friend Hudson, during the debates, that Liberty party grew out of its members seceding from the American Society, or a *false issue* called "*the woman question,*" while the true reason of their secession, was to accommodate the Church and clergy, "the bulwark of Slavery," who raised the *false* issue. It was a deception, endorsed by the originators of the party, with J. G. Birney at their head. The leading men in this movement, were the same who invited the women, the Grimkés and L. M. Child, into the field, and offered to employ them as agents, at the formation of the Society. Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth J. Neall, and others, united with the American Society, and took part in the discussions, with the hearty approbation of those men. The two Grimkés were invited to sit in the business meetings of the Executive Committee, with sixty agents, to discuss their plan of operations. And seven years afterwards, because a woman was allowed to speak in the meetings of this same society, and was placed on a Business Committee, we behold these men going out from us in great dudgeon, crying out, "the woman question"! Mr. Remond read the "Streak Letter," of Elizur Wright, to H. B. Stanton, "that they had shockingly mismanaged their cause; had made too much of *the confounded woman question,* and their life or death now depended on the organization of an abolition political party." What have we here but rank deception? Mr. Remond proceeded to read, from the published speech of H. B. Stanton, made at one of the annual meetings of the new organizers, setting forth how *they had come out from the old Society to accommodate the clergy,* and now, when they looked in their meetings for the clergy, they were not to be found. Also Lewis Tappan's fifteen or twenty reasons against the formation of a Liberty party. The deception played by these men in sending Birney, Stanton, and Colver, to the World's Convention, as the pretended representatives of the American Society, the two first under pay from the Society, while at that time, the formation of the American and Foreign Society was all planned, and when these men appeared in London, they reported themselves as the representatives of the latter society, (and paid by the former,) formed while they were on the Atlantic ocean. Where now are Messrs. Birney and Stanton? One in Michigan, the other in Boston, both in the practice of law, instead of pleading the slave's cause.

Mr. H. Borden, a Liberty party man, thought the woman question could not have been opposed by Liberty party men, inasmuch as the party were in favour of extending to women the right of suffrage. Furthermore, Liberty party originated with Myron Holley, in 1839, before the secession.

Mr. Seymour said the secession doubtless occurred for several reasons, perhaps already explained, and that the seceders merged into the party formed by Mr. Holley. The Abolitionists did not originally design the formation of such a party, but found such a party finally necessary.

Mr. Eastman said he got his Liberty partyism from Mr. Garrison. When he first published the Liberator, he was in favour of casting abolition votes, till he come out a no-Government man. Mr. Garrison threw the responsibility of the slave system on the Government and Church. He first originated a Liberty party. "Women's rights men" were in the Liberty party, and were ready to give women the right of suffrage.

Mr. Remond said that Mr. Garrison's political sentiments were not set forth by the last gentleman. Mr. Garrison, at that time, contended, as he does now, that all who conscientiously felt it to be their duty to go to the polls, should vote for the slave. When he spoke of the Liberty party, he had reference to the National Organization, recommended by E. Wright, jr. not any little petty organization here or there, which no one knew anything about—not such as had been claimed as such in Steuben [illegible] American Society had never entertained the question of "women's rights", but of human rights. Though much more might be adduced to sustain his charge that Liberty party originated in deception, he trusted he had brought forward sufficient evidence to satisfy any impartial mind. When he commenced his remarks, this evening, he did not think of getting into any discussion with Liberty party, it being known, we so widely differ. He would remark that he entertained a very great regard for many members that are in the party. He honoured Gerrit Smith for his humanity manifested in his munificcent gifts to the coloured men of this State—was sorry that he was in the Liberty party; being there, as Abby Kelley sometimes remarks, if he will stay in a crow's nest he must not complain if he gets shot as a crow. Adjourned to two o'clock, Friday, P. M.

Friday, P. M.—O. H. Gilbert in the chair. Prior to the Convention being called to order, J. C. Hathaway read to the friends, a resolution passed by the Liberty party State Convention, recently held at Cortland, commending "the moral courage of the Liberty party United States Senator, Hon. Mr. Cilley, for advocating, in his speech, the withdrawal of the United States army within our frontier." Mr. Hathaway remarked that this resolution was another specimen of Liberty party deception, in thus garbling Mr. Cilley's speech, when Mr. Cilley moved that the army be withdrawn, to be increased to fifty thousand—to be drilled and well prepared to strike a successful blow next winter. Several Liberty party men, filled with confusion, declared Mr. H. a liar. They were twice confounded, when they were referred to the Emancipator for the reported speech of Mr. Cilley.

Mr. B. Borden moved the resolution on the Constitution be laid on the table, to enable him to offer another. He cared not if it was laid under the table, or out of doors. Mr. B's. motion was negatived.

Mr. Borden then said he would offer the resolution as an amendment, which is as follows, verbatim et literatim. "Whereas, certain persons calling themselves men, have come in this village, and somehow got into this church—have most basely insulted and abused the minister and people of this church, by calling them pro-slavery, therefore, resolved, that, in the opinion of this meeting, they are base calumniators and liars, and ought not to be tolerated by the congregation that worship in this house." The amendment was seconded and negatived—two votes in affirmative.

E. D. Hudson then resumed the consideration of the fifth resolution on the Constitution and Disunion, remarking that he was an Abolitionist from principle, not from impulse, animal sympathy, or political or domestic policy. He acted on this principle—1st. Whatever is morally wrong, can never, by any act of man, or association of men, become morally right, or even "politically expedient." 2d. Whatever is morally wrong, no man can support or connive at, one moment, knowingly, with impunity. 3d. What is morally wrong for me to do as an individual, is equally wrong for me to delegate another man to do for me. That the enslaving of men, is a sin, there being no sin equal to it, no one can doubt. Then, if the Constitution is slaveholding, it is grossly immoral. That it is a slaveholding compact, we have not only its letter, but the positive declaration of its framers; those who adopted it, and the universal admission of the people of this Government, for sixty years, and in addition, all the legislative bodies and courts, both Federal and State, to prove it. Friend Ward, in his defence of the Constitution as Anti-Slavery, admitted the clause respecting the *Slave-Trade,* to have been immoral. And is it not now immoral; though, for the time being, thrown into a passive state? Suppose Congress should repeal its act to restrict the Slave-Trade, (and have we not equal reason to expect it will, as we had that it would annex Texas,) for the accommodation of new territory acquired, would it not then become actively an immoral provision of that instrument? But I am not enough of a no-Government man to interpret the Constitution to suit my convenience. The framers did not intend I should be; hence they provided for it an interpreter. That interpreter is the Supreme Court of the United States. Their interpretation is the supreme law of the land; it is to be the governing rule of every member of the Government, until amended. This is what all swear to, who vote or hold office under the United States Government. Mr. H. was asked if the Bible did not provide an interpreter? Mr. H. No. Every man is left to interpret it agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, and to act accordingly. The Bible provided no priest to interpret it for him, but left him to do it for himself—to think, speak, and act for himself; being amenable to God alone for his acts. Now admit that the Constitution is succeptible of an Anti-Slavery interpretation, what is it worth after all? The Supreme Court has decreed it to be slaveholding, and their decree is fundamental law. Where am I? Is it my prerogative to trample on their decision, while a member of the Government, and set up my Ebenezer in opposition? Nay, verily, I make myself a dishonest, a perjured man if I do it. (Hear, hear.) It is not my prerogative, or J. G. Birney's though elected to the Presidency, to do any such thing. No man can hold an office himself, or vote for another to do it for him, as an Abolitionist, under the present form of Government. Mr. Birney, if elected President, at the next election, could not enter upon the duties of his office as an Abolitionist; he will have to throw his Anti-Slavery aside before he can pass through the wicked gate, the ordeal of the oath of office, into the Presidential Chair. He goes there as an executor, not as an interpreter of the Constitution. It is the prerogative of the Judiciary to interpret, and his to *execute.* Cilley had to throw his Anti-Slavery aside when he took his oath of office—he is a sworn slaveholder, his professions to the contrary notwithstanding. (Hear, hear.)

Suppose Mr. Birney elected President, the commander-in-chief of the army and navy of this Government—suppose the slaves in Virginia rise up in rebellion, a "domestic invasion" against that State Government, as in the Southampton insurrection, and the Executive of that State calls for aid of J. G. Birney? Mr. Birney is under oath to send the militia to the aid of Virginia—as Tyler did to Rhode Island, to suppress the Dorrites. The Supreme Court of the United States have decided that that clause in the Constitution relating to the recapture of fugitive slaves, is the fundamental law of the United States Government; and that clause which reads, "shall be delivered up," makes it obligatory [illegible] part of United States officers to execute it. Suppose a fugitive slave came here into our midst, pleading for mercy; his master with a warrant, and the United States Marshal arrive in quick pursuit to arrest the slave; you resist his arrest; the master refers you to your bond, and *the Marshal, your sworn agent,* demands your assistance; you still resist. What is now the alternative? The Marshal falls back upon J. G. Birney, for military power, sufficient to enable him to recapture the slave. J. G. Birney is sworn to back up the Marshal, to whom he sustains the same relation, as the Governor of New-York did to the sheriff in the case of the anti-renters, and agreeable to his oath and duties of office, ordered out the militia to back up the sheriff, to enable him to collect the rents, and arrest those who resisted the sheriff.

Thus in applying my Anti-Slavery principles to the Constitution of the United States, on the interpretation of the Supreme Court, can I hold an office under it, or vote for another man to do it for me, without sacrificing my principles? Certainly not. Then what is my duty, most rationally to be inferred, growing out of my principles and the position I find myself in? Why most certainly to dissolve my relation with such a Government. "Cease to do evil;" "wash my hands and make them clean" of the blood of the slave. I hear Mr. "Carnal Policy" talking about consequences, anarchy, bloodshed, &c. &c. What have we now, I will ask, but anarchy? What is this nation now doing but spilling the blood of innocent men, women, and children, for the benefit of Slavery? And Daniel Webster, who talks about the bloody consequences of such a course on the part of the North, what is he now doing but encouraging his son to go as a human butcher, to drench the earth with the blood of his brother for the defence and perpetuity of American Slavery? If we are going to fight and spill blood, let it be done in the cause of liberty and not of Slavery. But talk not to me about the consequences, ye *infidels* and *atheists,* of dissolving our Union with slaveholders. Read the consequences of Slavery upon all of our liberties and institutions, in the history of this nation for the past sixty years, and you have a verification of the word of God, "they that spoil shall be spoiled." Then open your eyes, ye "brutish", and behold the blessed consequences of doing right in the British West Indies, since the year 1834, as a verification of God's promise, "the light shall break forth as the morning, thy truth shall spring forth speedily, thy righteousness shall go before thee, *and the glory of the Lord* shall be thy rereward," &c. Have you confidence in the promise of Almighty God? You know you have not. Then talk no longer about infidelity, while you are the personification of it.

(*To be continued.*)

WATERLOO FAIR.

FRIEND GAY:—I have seen no account as yet of the Fair held at Waterloo, N. Y. and if none comes to hand before this, you may give this a place in the columns of the Standard. The Fair was held, as you are aware, on Thursday and Friday, February, 25th and 26th, in the assembly room of the Waterloo Hotel. It opened on Thursday at one o'clock in the afternoon, and closed on Friday evening between ten and eleven o'clock. A large number were in attendance during the whole of the time, and especially in the evenings, when the room was crowded. On the last evening they had a public supper. The getters up of the Fair were a few faithful, true-hearted friends of the slave, in Waterloo and Junius. Yet I think great credit is due to the inhabitants of Waterloo and Seneca Falls generally, for their co-operation. I think that those who got up

DEFECTIVE, ORIGINAL COPY

the Fair would have been well paid if they had not received a single dollar, over and above their expenses. The impression which it seems to have made upon the minds of those present and the good feeling which it left would have paid them.

Persons were engaged in helping to get up the Fair who were never before in an Anti-Slavery Fair, or meeting. The mottos which were upon the walls were read again and again by those present. On one side of the hall were wrought in letters of evergreen:

Perish Party, perish Clan;
Strike for Freedom while ye can,
In the strength of one strong man.

And on the other side was to be seen the motto of the American Anti-Slavery Society, "No Union with Slaveholders." The latter created no little talk among those who were strangers to our cause. Some who had identified themselves with the Abolitionists before they had counted the cost, had some hesitancy about the propriety of hoisting the motto of "No Union with Slaveholders." But the Abolitionists could make no compromise with Slavery. Their receipts were one hundred and ninety dollars, being a larger sum than was received at the Rochester or West Winfield Fairs. It was my good fortune to be present at both of the other Fairs, and I think the impression left at Waterloo decidedly better than at either of the other places, and did more good than half a dozen Conventions would have done. Yours for humanity,

W. W. BROWN.

WEST WINFIELD, March 15th, 1847.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1847.

Lysander Spooner on the Constitution.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTENANCE OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."—Gouverneur Morris.

We pass to the next point of Mr. Spooner's argument, that the Constitution of the United States legally interpreted, does not recognize or sanction Slavery. He considers himself to have proved:

"That the Constitution of the United States, not only does not recognize or sanction Slavery, as a legal institution, but that, on the contrary, it presumes all men to be free; that it positively denies the right of property in man; and that it, *of itself*, makes it impossible for Slavery to have a legal existence in *any* of the United States."—(pp. 56, 57.)

What, then, are the legal rules by which the Constitution is to be interpreted? The following are those selected by Mr. Spooner, and upon these he bases his argument:

1st. The language of C. J. Marshall, in Ogden *v.* Saunders; (12 Wheaton, 332;) where he said that, in construing the Constitution:

"The intention of the instrument must prevail; that this intention must be collected from its words; that its words are to be understood in that sense in which they are *generally used* by those for whom the instrument was intended, that its provisions are neither to be restricted into insignificance nor extended to objects not comprehended in them, nor contemplated by its framers."

2d. The rule laid down by the Supreme Court in 2 Cranch, 390. Here Mr. Spooner has rightly enough quoted but a single sentence; we prefer, however, to give the entire paragraph, that the reader may have before him the *whole* doctrine, as the Court laid it down. The sentence quoted and relied upon by Mr. Spooner is the second, which, for distinction, we have included in brackets.

"That the consequences, are to be considered in expounding laws, where the intent is doubtful, is a principle not to be controverted; but it is also true that it is a principle which must be applied with caution, and which has a degree of influence dependent on the nature of the case to which it is applied. [Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the law is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a Court of justice to suppose a design to effect such objects.] But where only a political regulation is made, which is inconvenient, if the intention of the Legislature be expressed in terms which are sufficiently intelligibly to leave no doubt in the mind when the words are taken in their ordinary sense, it would be going a great way to say that a constrained interpretation must be put on them to avoid an inconvenience which ought to have been contemplated by the Legislature when the act was passed, and which, in their opinion, was probably counterbalanced by the particular advantages it was calculated to produce."

This latter rule is explained by Mr. Spooner to amount to this: (p. 62)

"That where words are susceptible of two meanings, one consistent, and the other inconsistent, with justice and natural right, that meaning, and *only that* meaning, which is consistent with right, shall be attributed to them—unless other parts of the instrument overrule that interpretation."

And that in order to sanction anything contrary to natural right, the terms must be "plenary, express, explicit, distinct, unequivocal," (p. 59.) and must need "no extraneous or historical evidence to fix upon them their immoral meaning."—(p. 62.)

We shall defer our criticism on this *explanation* to a future time, and granting Mr. Spooner, for the present, all he asks, proceed to consider the argument he has erected upon this basis. We will first, however, remind the reader of two other rules, which Mr. Spooner will not dispute, so universally recognized as not to need proof, but which will be found in the places named.

1st. "Every word in the Constitution is to be expounded in its *plain, obvious, and common sense*, unless the context furnishes some ground to control, qualify, or enlarge it. If a word has a technical and a common sense, the latter is to be preferred, unless some attendant circumstance points clearly to the former."

Story Comm. 1, 436, 438. C. J. Marshall 1, Wheaton, 304. 12, Wheaton 332. 1, Brock, 423. Dwarris, 702. Kent's Comm. 1, 462. Chitty on Contracts, 81. Blackstone, 1, 60. Federalist, 83.

In 4, Wheaton, 122, Chief Justice Marshall, speaking of a "departure from the obvious meaning of words," says:

"If in any case the *plain meaning* of a provision, not contradicted by any other provision in the same instrument, is to be disregarded, because we believe the framers of that instrument could not intend what they say, it must be one in which the absurdity and injustice of applying the provision to the case would be so monstrous that all mankind would, without hesitation, unite in rejecting the application."—C. J. Marshall 4. Wheaton 122.

2d. Every word must be made to have some meaning.—Chitty on Contracts—Blackstone 2. 380—Bacon's Abridg't Statute, 1 Cranch 137.

In the light of these rules let us open the Constitution. The first clause we meet is as follows: (Art. 1, Sec. 2.)

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of *free* persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand; but each State shall have at least one Representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three, Massachusetts eight, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations one, Connecticut five, New-York six, New Jersey four, Pennsylvania eight, Delaware one, Maryland six, Virginia ten, North Carolina five, South Carolina five, and Georgia three.

Upon this Mr. Spooner remarks:

"The argument claimed from this clause, in support of Slavery rests entirely upon the word 'free,' and the words 'all other persons.' Or rather, it rests entirely upon the meaning of the word 'free,' for the application of the words 'all other persons' depends upon the meaning given to the word 'free.' The slave argument *assumes, gratuitously*, that the word 'free' is used as the correlative of Slavery, and thence it infers that the words 'all other persons,' mean slaves."—(p. 73.)

He then proceeds to argue that the clause has no relation or reference to slaves—that to suppose it to have subjects us to all sorts of "difficulties, inconsistencies, contradictions, and absurdities," but he assures us that these will all vanish if, with him, we hold that:

"The word 'free' describes the native and naturalized citizens of the United States, and the words 'all other persons' describe resident aliens, 'Indians not taxed,' and possibly some others."—(p. 78.)

Mr. Spooner nowhere denies that the "*plain, obvious, and common*" use of the word "*free*" is to designate one not a slave: and he allows that if it be so interpreted here, the Constitution must be confessed to recognize Slavery. But he informs us that the word has also a technical legal meaning, designating a person in any community, who is invested with peculiar privileges, &c. and so might describe a citizen as distinguished from an alien. This is true. He asks us to pass by the plain, obvious, and common meaning, and adopt this technical one, in accordance with his rule above quoted, that where words are capable of two meanings, the one consistent with justice, is to be preferred to that which is not so. Now, here the Court is in a dilemma. We bow to his rule; we are anxious to construe this clause so as to defeat injustice and sustain the right. But while, on the other side, *he* tells us that by adopting the obvious meaning of the word "free," we shall recognize Slavery,—Mr. Gerrit Smith, and other tender consciences, intreat us to hold that this word "free" does exclude slaves, and hence the clause allows only three-fifths of such to be represented; assuring us that this arrangement is "a bounty on liberty, and an attempt to promote the Anti-Slavery cause."—(Smith, to Whittier.)

Besides, we know that the clause, in our sense, was reluctantly submitted to by the South, as an unfair abridgement of their rights, and exulted in at the North as a just rebuke of a bad system. This, therefore, cannot be a case "so monstrous" that, in the language of Marshall, "all mankind would, *without hesitation*, unite in rejecting the application." It rather resembles one of those "political inconveniences" referred to in the citation from Cranch, with whose *results* Courts have nothing to do.

Again, Mr. Spooner and his friends, object to our construction as working injustice, because the master now votes (practically) for three-fifths of his slaves. Suppose the Court adopts his interpretation. The master will then get *all* his slaves counted instead of three-fifths of them! The Court cannot see how that result will much aid the cause of justice. We cannot oblige Carolina to allow her slaves to vote, no, not even if they should be emancipated. If the Constitution considers the slaves property, then it recognizes Slavery. If, as Mr. Spooner asserts, it does not recognize Slavery, then it must, as he all along allows, consider the slave a person. The slaves being persons, they *must be included* either among "free persons," or among "three-fifths of all *other* persons." The last is the old pro-slavery construction. If, on the other hand, Mr. Spooner, or any one else, shall so construe "free persons" as to include the slaves, the only result of this new interpretation will be to *increase* the political weight of the slaveholders by just two-fifths of their slaves! The Court thinks it better, *in this view*, to adhere to the *obvious* meaning of the clause. It acknowledges that the clause is bad, as now interpreted, but the proposed change only makes it "TWO-FIFTHS" worse. The Court will cheerfully go out of its track to adopt a strained construction to subserve justice, but never will do so when the only result of such "departure from the plain and obvious meaning" is to strengthen the hand of the tyrant. Mr. Spooner's rule, therefore, of preferring the righteous to the unrighteous meaning of ambiguous words, does not apply here. Unhappily no *choice* is left us, and we must adhere to the obvious meaning, which leaves the Constitution pro-slavery.*

But though Mr. Spooner does not deny that this use of the word "free" is the plain, obvious, and common one, he yet maintains that the word had, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, obtained a fixed and well-known usage, in the law, in his sense. He says:

Up to the time of our revolution, the *only* meaning which the words "free" and "freemen" had, in the English law, in the *charters granted to the colonies*, and in the important documents of a political character, when used to designate one person as distinguished from another, was to designate a person enjoying some franchise or privilege, as distinguished from aliens or persons not enjoying a similar franchise. They were never used to designate a free person as distinguished from a slave—for the very sufficient reason that all these *fundamental* laws presumed that there were no slaves.—(p. 48.)

But throughout the English law, and among all the variety of ways, in which the word "free" and "freemen" are used, as *legal* terms, they are *never used as the correlatives, or opposites of slaves or Slavery*—and for the reason that they have in England no such persons or institutions, known to their laws, as slaves or Slavery.—(p. 46.)

The English law had for centuries used the word "free" as describing persons possessing citizenship, or some other franchise or peculiar privilege—as distinguished from aliens, and persons not possessed of such franchise or privilege. This law, and this use of the word "free," as has already been shown, (Ch. 6.) had been adopted in this country from its first settlement. The colonial charters all (probably without an exception) recognized it. The colonial legislation generally, if not universally, recognized it. The State Constitutions, in existence at the time the Constitution of the United States was formed and adopted, used the word in this sense, *and no other*.—(p. 74.)

The above Italics are Mr. Spooner's.

We might allow this, and still remind Mr. Spooner that all jurists and statesmen have held the Constitution to be a popular instrument,—intended for the people at large, and hence that all words are to be taken in their obvious and general sense, unless something in the context requires a technical one: and such is this which he suggests.

But the statements above quoted are entirely unfounded in fact. "The words free and freemen" never used in English law to designate a free person as distinguished from a slave"! Open Jacobs' Law Dictionary, a book of good authority, and choose the edition of 1772. which the makers of the Constitution might have used, and we read, "*Freeman, liber homo, is one distinguished from a slave*, that is born or made free." This is the *first* clause of the definition. In his citation from Jacobs, Mr. Spooner has omitted it, and quoted only what follows; see his 45th page.

Unroll the parchment of Magna Charta; its most famous clause begins, "*Nullus liber homo*," (*no free man*,) which Coke tells us (2 Inst. 45.) "extends to villeins saving against their lords, for they are *free* against all men but their lords."

Villeins, Coke tells us, were *servi*, (slaves,) and he deduces their origin from Ham, as men do our present Slavery. This is the system of Slavery which the Common Law allowed and recognized, though Messrs. Spooner and Goodell will have it that the Common Law never allowed Slavery. The words "free and freeman," in the sense of not a slave, occur frequently, both in Littleton and Coke. We take a few instances:

"No tenure shall ever make a *freeman* villeine."—(Coke Litt. s. 172.)

"If a freeman take lands to hold by villein service this maketh not the *freeman* a villeine."—(Ib s. 174.)

"If a freeman hath divers issues (*children*) and afterwards confesseth himself to be a villeine in a court of record, yet these issues, which he hath before the confession are *free*; the issues after shall be villeins."—(Ib. s. 176.)

Again; Blackstone tells us (2. 104.) that the old definition, by Britton, of a *freehold* estate in land, as distinguished from other tenures, was, "the possession of the soil by a *freeman*." Now as aliens cannot hold land in England, this definition is nonsense, if we interpret the word freeman in Mr. Spooner's sense, one not an alien. But interpreted as the writer and Blackstone meant it to signify, one not a villein or slave, it rightly distinguishes this kind of estate from copyhold and base tenures.

We might adduce other instances; but have seen enough to test Mr. Spooner's assertion that these words are *never* used in the English law as opposed to slave and Slavery.

Let us come to our own side of the ocean. Every public document previous to the Revolution, and every State Constitution in America at the time of the adoption of the United States Constitution, used these words in his sense *and no other*, says Mr. Spooner. Let us see. The United States Constitution was adopted in 1787. In March, 1776, South Carolina adopted her first Constitution, and declared that the "claims of Parliament would reduce them from the rank of *freemen* to the most abject *slavery*."

In 1776, Virginia adopted her Constitution, declaring "that all men are by nature equally *free* and independent."

Constitution of Pennsylvania, 1776: "All men are born equally *free* and independent."

Constitution of Massachusetts, 1780: "All men are born *free* and equal." And this word is held to have abolished Slavery in the Commonwealth.

Constitution of New Hampshire, 1783: "All men are born equally *free* and independent;" words which, Dr. Belknap tells us, freed all slaves *born there after* that date.—Mass. Hist. Coll. 4, 204.

The great Anti-Slavery Statute of Pennsylvania, in 1780, has this clause: "No man or woman, except the negroes and mulattoes registered as aforesaid, shall be held as slaves or servants for life, but as *free men* and *free women*.

In 1784, Connecticut enacted that no negro or mulatto child born in the State after 1st of March 1784, should be held in servitude longer than till the age of twenty-five years, "but such child at the age aforesaid shall be *free*."

To fix the meaning of a word in the Constitution of thirteen United States, it is fair to consult the laws of all. But if we open the Statute Books of any of them, we shall find the word used almost every year in contradistinction from slaves; and of course more frequently the further South we go in our search. Indeed it is ludicrous to say of the legislation of thirteen States, *all of which had held slaves till within seven years, and twelve of which still hold them*, that they did not use the word "free" to distinguish those persons not slaves. They could not have framed their Statutes without the use of such a word.

With these facts we leave the reader to rate at its true value this assertion of Mr. Spooner's as to the use of the word "free," in the public documents and Constitutions of these States, in his sense and NO OTHER.

But let us look again at the clause itself and see, from the context, whether we can, without making nonsense of the whole, allow the word "free" to have any meaning but the one usually given it, *i. e.* not enslaved. For it is a rule alike of law and common sense that law-makers must be supposed to mean something, and that any construction which makes words superfluous or insignificant, or the whole clause foolish, is not to be admitted. And Mr. Spooner himself allows, (p. 82,) as above quoted, that the wicked meaning must be adopted if the "other parts of the instrument" (the context) require it.

1st. "By adding to the whole number of *free* persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

So says the Constitution. If "free persons" is taken to mean persons at liberty—persons not bound to servitude, we see at once the propriety of the law-makers using a" in preference to include, among [illegible] those wished so to distinguish their case. Had this been omitted, some might have argued that strictly speaking such were not *free persons*. Hence the necessity of this special direction. But on Mr. Spooner's interpretation of "free persons," meaning all native born citizens, where is the necessity of giving any such direction? Nobody ever dreamt that being bound apprentice destroyed a man's citizenship! They would naturally have been included among *his free persons* without any special direction. The careful insertion of this parenthesis proves that Mr. Spooner's notion was not in the mind of the writer.

2d. Again; "excluding Indians not taxed." Chief Justice Marshall says (12 Wheaton 419,) that

"It is a rule of interpretation to which all assent that the *exception* of a particular thing from general words proves that in the opinion of the lawgiver, the thing excepted would be within the general clause, had the exception not been made," and that this is "applicable to the Constitution."

Apply this rule and it proves our construction correct, and Mr. Spooner's unsound. With our view of the meaning of "free persons," Indians being *persons*, and also *free*, (not enslaved,) would naturally be included unless, as here, there was special direction given to exclude them. But on Mr. Spooner's hypothesis why insert any caution when there was no danger of mistake? A few civilized Indians had joined the whites, and been *taxed*, and were sometimes considered to resemble *citizens*, though that is still a disputed point. But it had never entered the wildest imagination to consider the roving, *untaxed* tribes as native *citizens* of the States, any more than now the dwellers on the Rocky Mountains would be considered citizens of the United States. This again shows his view to be incorrect. (See Judge Marshall's in the Cherokee Nation *v.* Georgia 5, Peters 1, allowing that Indians are foreigners, aliens.)

3d. "Other persons" Mr. Spooner defines to be aliens and "Indians not taxed." These last cannot be included, because, 1st. The grammatical construction of the sentence forbids it. They are to be "other" than *free*, other than those "*bound to service*," and other than *Indians*. 2d. According to the well-known rule of law which bids us interpret doubtful clauses in any law by referring to the same words in other laws of the same nation on the same subject, (see Kent 1, 463. Lord Mansfield 1 Burr. 447, Blackstone 1. 62, note. Dwarris 699, Bacon's Ab. Statute,) we must construe this by the old Resolve from which it is copied, passed by the Continental Congress, 18th April, 1783, that "expenses should be paid by the several States in proportion to the whole number of white and other free inhabitants, of every age, sex, and condition, including those bound to servitude for a term of years, and three-fifths of all *other persons except Indians*, not paying taxes in each State. (Story Comm. 2. 112.) 3d. Why should States agree to pay direct taxes for even three-fifths of those from whom they were not themselves getting any tax or gain? The same reason,—that they were not taxed,—which excluded Indians from the list of "free persons," would exclude them also from the three-fifth portion of the basis. If this be so, then, 4th. Aliens are the only ones left to be included among "other persons," on Mr. Spooner's plan. Now *there never yet was a State which took account of aliens in fixing its basis of representation*. Again, the reason why three-fifths only of a certain class was allowed to be reckoned was evidently because it was supposed that class would be *unequally distributed* through the Union, and a portion of it only was reckoned to restore the balance. If of this class (whichever it was) all the States had had equal portions, it would manifestly be indifferent whether all of it was counted or none. Now the slaves answer to this description, and make the provision a sensible and intelligible one. But aliens do not. All the States were on or near the seaboard; they had all enough land to spare, and held out different, but about equal, advantages to immigrants. All were anxious to get such, and regarded the arrival of foreigners, bringing with them as they did, always labour, and often capital, as a real blessing, (witness the debates of that day); so much of a gain that they would gladly have paid, and would have been considered by their sister States, as bound and able to pay full tax for them, instead of being let off with three-fifths. The provision becomes, therefore, on Mr. Spooner's hypothesis, absurd; and hence the interpretation is not to be admitted. Or as the States expected about *equal* increase from this quarter, it would be inoperative and void—which again renders the construction legally inadmissible.

But the consideration that conclusively shows Mr. Spooner's hypothesis to be untenable is the construction put upon this clause by the Constitution itself. The latter part of the clause *fixes the first apportionment of representatives*. We can examine that scale and test the whole matter, seeing which interpretation comports with the numbers there set down.

Referring to that, the reader will find that New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New-York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, then considered as free States, were allowed, *by the Constitution itself*, thirty-five Representatives. Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North and South Carolina, and Georgia, the slave States, were allowed thirty Representatives. Now we have no exact census to refer to; there was none. The *data* probably used to estimate these numbers were the same with those by which the old Congress apportioned taxes under the Resolve above cited. (See Journal of Congress Sept. 27, 1785, and elsewhere.) As the above numbers conform generally to the ratio there used, which was *confessedly* calculated on the basis of reckoning *three-fifths of the slaves*, it proves that the *same rule was followed here*, and so settles the question.

If Mr. Spooner dislikes this method of proof we can give him a different one. Let us refer to the nearest official census, that of 1790, taken only three years after. The above named free States had then 1,968,455 inhabitants. The slave States had 1,303,845 free inhabitants, and 657 527 slaves. If the reader will go over the calculation he will find that on the basis of reckoning three-fifths of the slaves, the numbers (35 and 30) given to each grand division are as exact as could *possibly* be. On Mr. Spooner's plan, being equal in absolute numbers (1,968,455, to 1,961,372,) they should have been equal also in the number of their Representatives.

Again; take separate States, where to be sure there would be more chance of error than in a general survey. Still, making due allowance for such mistakes, unavoidable before any general census had ever been made, we find evidence of the same rule being observed. Select the old and best known States, about which there would be least probability of error. Take first two free States. Compare Pennsylvania (434,000 inhabitants) with Massachusetts, then including Maine, 474,000. About equal in population, they have, as we should anticipate, an equal number of Representatives, *eight* assigned to each. Compare Virginia, then including Kentucky, 821,000, with North Carolina, then including Tennessee, 428,000, the first nearly double the last, and their Representatives preserving the same ratio, 10 to 5. Now compare a free and a slave State; Pennsylvania, (434,000) with North Carolina (428,000,) about equal in population, the first is allowed *eight* and the last only *five* Representatives. How is this to be explained on the "alien" hypothesis? Again, compare Pennsylvania, (434,000,) with Virginia (821,000); the last nearly double of the first, but not as was the case in comparing her with North Carolina, allowed double the number of Representatives; no, she has only ten to Pennsylvania's eight. How is this to be explained on the alien hypothesis?

If we allow Mr. Spooner to include three-fifths of the Indians among "other persons," their numbers are not sufficient to explain this difficulty. Their whole number in all the thirteen States was supposed to be only 30,000. See Jefferson Notes. Holmes' Annals. N. Am. Rev.

And at the time this first apportionment was made there were, according to Mr. Spooner's own admission, (pp. [illegible]) no Indians at all to be counted in any way; as he says the Constitution made citizens of all persons then residing in the country. This makes these differences of numbers still more inexplicable on his plan.

But now glance along the census and observe how many of the swelling numbers of the Old Dominion are marked "*slaves*," and then reckon only three-fifths of those—and the whole riddle is solved. So too of North Carolina.

We have made the above calculations on the official census of 1790. But if we recur to the estimates which *might* have been, and probably were, in the hands of the Convention the result is the same. For instance—Massachusetts, by her private census of 1784, contained 357,510 inhabitants. Virginia never had a census, but by Jefferson's calculation from accurate data, made in 1782, she had at that time 567,614, inhabitants viz:—296,852 free, and 270,762 slaves, (Notes, p. 126 &c.) Now according to these numbers, on Mr. Spooner's plan, if Massachusetts had eight Representatives, Virginia, should have had thirteen. On our plan she should have had, *as she did*, just ten.

Mr. Spooner's hypothesis, then, if admitted, proves that the Constitution did not understand itself! He does not deny that the words are *capable* of bearing the common pro-slavery construction; they are then, as he demands, words should be to make a wicked law valid, "*plenary*." Taking the above considerations into view, they are seen to be "*express, explicit, distinct, and unequivocal*," and any Court must hold the meaning, wicked as it is, to be expressed with "irresistible clearness."

Thus granting Mr. Spooner all the principles of construction, he asks, and allowing also that the word "free" is susceptible of two meanings, we have still shown.

1st. That to adopt the most unusual meaning does not get rid of the injustice of the old interpretation, but only *increases* it,—consequently his rule of preferring the righteous to the unrighteous meaning does not apply here.

2d. That the context will not allow any meaning but the usual one to be given to this word without making nonsense of the whole clause. Even then if that rule does apply, we have brought the case within the *exception* stated by Mr. Spooner in the sentence above quoted from his 62d page; that the righteous meaning must be given up and the unrighteous one adopted, however reluctantly, when "the *other parts* of the Instrument require it."

In addition to the argument on the word "free," Mr. Spooner makes but three points.

1st. That there was no Slavery in the States to which our meaning can apply. This falls under our third division and will be fully considered then.

2d. He says: "It is very evident that the word 'free' is not used as the correlative of Slavery, because 'Indians not taxed' are 'excluded' from its application, yet they are not, therefore, slaves."—(p. 74.)

This is a strange mistake on his part. The inference here is precisely the other way. Indians are *specially* "excluded," *because* they are "free," and not slaves, and *naturally* have been reckoned with free persons; hence the necessity, as it was not designed to include them, to insert a precise direction.

3d. The difficulty of ascertaining who are free and who slaves. He says the Government, on our plan, have no legal information, and are obliged to depend on varying State laws. Very true; this is often the case in other matters, and furnishes no objection to our interpretation. In this very section of the Constitution, the electors of Representatives in each State, are to be those who are "electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature." Congress, therefore, in ascertaining whether its own members are chosen, has to depend on the laws of the States, which may be, and are different in different States, and may be changed every year. Beside, it is as easy to find legal evidence that a man is or is not a slave, as that he is or is not an Indian, an apprentice, or an alien. These three things are to be proved even on Mr. Spooner's plan, and he must go out of the Constitution to prove them, to family Bibles, to private indentures, to actual inspection. Proving slavery is just the same, and just as easy.

But even if any special "inconveniences" would result, they are not to be considered by a Court when the language is clear and the intention plain.—See our quotation above, from 2. Cranch, 390—also 2. Cr. 203. Dwarris, &c. &c.—10 Mod. 344. Mr. Justice Coleridge, 6 A & E 7.

So far we have taken for granted all the explanations which Mr. Spooner has given of these legal rules. In our next we shall offer some criticisms on those explanations. Meanwhile we would remind the reader that while Mr. Spooner is bound to show that *every* clause in the Constitution is pure and Anti-Slavery, in order to sustain his hypothesis, if we make out that any *single one* recognizes the institution, it as fully destroys his argument, as if we proved a dozen to be in that predicament.—W. P.

Progress.

We hardly count by years yet since some of the gentlemen of the Liberty party made the notable invention of the unconstitutionality of Slavery. It seems, however, not to answer entirely the purpose for which it was intended, of doing that which a somewhat high authority once pronounced impossible—to serve God and Mammon. A still later invention is announced in last week's Washington Era: namely, that Slavery is neither constitutional nor unconstitutional! One more step only is necessary—to declare that Slavery does not exist at all. The science of Anti-Slavery-made-easy will then be complete.

One of the Liberty party coadjutors of the Era, has taken that paper to task for certain articles which are supposed to maintain the constitutionality of Slavery. In reply, the Era illustrates its position, by a reference to the Church Establishment of the Cantons of Switzerland, which exists by the local laws of some of the States, without, in any way, coming under the jurisdiction of the federative Diet, and is, therefore, neither constitutional nor unconstitutional.

This, the editor of the Era thinks clearly explains his position on the constitutionality of Slavery. Congress, he says, has no power to establish or maintain the chattel system in any territory under its exclusive jurisdiction. Neither has it the power to abolish that system in any State of the Union where it now exists. For the power to do either is not delegated to it by the Constitution. This is sound doctrine, and we know of no Disunion Abolitionist who does not, and has not always, maintained it.

But the real question as to the constitutionality of Slavery is not whether Congress has the power to abolish it in the States, or permit its existence in the Territories or District, but whether *it receive support in the States from the Constitution*. On this point we get no light as to the position of the Era, from its illustration drawn from the Swiss Confederation. There is, in fact, no parallel here between the Swiss Cantons and the American Union. Though the slave States did not give to the Federal Government the power to abolish Slavery, they demanded and obtained from the Federal Government a guaranty and protection for their peculiar institution, which under the old Articles of Confederation they did not have. Does the Era deny this? Will it let us know where it stands on this question? Does it mean to maintain the ground, taken, we believe, universally, by every other Liberty party paper in the country, of the absolute unconstitutionality of Slavery? Or will it maintain, in all its length and breadth, this new doctrine, that Slavery is neither constitutional nor unconstitutional? The Era stands with its face Southward, as the representative of the Liberty party. Let us know, then, whether the Northern and Southern aspect of this party are one and the same thing. If the Era does not agree with his coadjutors, but honestly believes that the Constitution does support Slavery,—a fact we had not doubted, till we received its last number—he should state clearly where he does stand, if he would not render himself liable to the imputation of being afraid on the one hand of offending his Northren readers, and on the other, of frightening those of the South. This new dogma is a mere dodging of the question.

"Much of the purest and most true-hearted humanitary poetry of this day, is at the same time the saddest, because it wings its flight so into the vague, and has not verified and found a pilot for its [illegible]" The Harbinger is becoming somewhat noted for the kind of thought and language of which the above extract is a specimen. If the Fourierites seriously believe that no class of people have received any, even feeble rays of truth but themselves, they are of course, perfectly right in saying so, whenever the proper time occurs for the enunciation of a truth so unpleasant to others. But the self-complacency which is continually putting it forward, in season and out of season, does not at least recommend itself to our good taste. It may be that we are wrong, and it may be, if right, that we need rather to live up to our own precept than offer it to others, but it certainly seems to us, that the true reformer will always busy himself more in pronouncing the truth itself than in assuring the world that he alone is the true man.

We happened once to hear the leading Fourierite of this country say, that no man could understand the system of the founder of his philosophy in less than forty years study. If for no other reason, then, we have not yet lived long enough by some years to become thoroughly indoctrinated in the Fourier system. We put in a plea, therefore, of mitigation of punishment, for ourselves, and nearly all the rest of the world at the same time, for neglecting to fall blindly into the ranks of a Phalanx when we see before us so much to do, for which, we humbly believe, we understand the necessity, and realize the evil for which we think we see the remedy.

However vague the "humanitary poetry" of the day may be—though we confess we do not perceive it—the charge would have come with a better grace from almost any other quarter. The world has existed some thousands of years, and every system of society that has ever yet been conceived has been tried, except that of Fourierism. This system has only been invented within the last half-century. It is as vague as a theory which has never been fully tried must necessarily be. It is, then, rather more than can be readily granted, that a mere theory, which experiment has never verified, deserves the name of science, and above all, of the only certain science worth singing or talking about. Had the Fourierites ever taken any corner of the earth, and developed there the perfect result they promise, we would willingly yield to them the right of rebuking those "fragmentary reformers" who only aim at, and are only successful in, redeeming or saving from some great wrong or vice, a few millions of their fellow-men at a time.

We trust, however, that we shall not be thought to be of that class who would throw obstacles in the way of the Fourierites. We would to Heaven, that they might be speedily successful in reforming society. As a step toward that end, we would suggest that in the meantime the better men may be made by the efforts of the small and "fragmentary" reformers, the more fitted will they be to enter upon the enjoyments which the "science of the soul" shall offer them; and that the Fourierites will be wise in encouraging rather than discouraging, and even in assisting, the efforts of those who are yet in the darkness of the "vague."

Organization.

JOHN BAILEY, of New Bedford, proposes, in a letter to the Liberator, that a meeting of delegates from the Executive Boards of the county Societies of Massachusetts, be held in Boston, in June, for the purpose of co-operation in holding county meetings. The suggestion is a good one. At no time since the commencement of the Anti-Slavery enterprise has there been more need of organization than now. In years past it was needed to create public sentiment; now it is wanted that that public sentiment may be directed into the most useful channel, and may indeed flow onward in one mighty current rather than continue diffused in a thousand little streams. In years past it was necessary that two or three should band themselves together, that united they might have the strength to attack the outposts of the enemy's camp. Now those posts are carried, and the multitude which is rushing on to the citadel itself needs also to be organized for systematic effort, and a speedy and successful result. "Order is Heaven's first law," and there is no order without organization. All nature teaches it from the "flowery stars" to the "starry flowers."

There is no good reason why the whole North should not be covered with Anti-Slavery societies, all independent, yet all co-operative and mutually dependent.—The impulse which this would give to the cause cannot be estimated too highly. The great majority of our own friends are now doing nothing except to subscribe for, and read the newspapers—an important thing in itself, but by no means the only thing necessary to do; and even if it were, they might and should extend immensely the good which may be done by our various weekly publications. But in every town and county where there are Abolitionists, societies should be organized. No better basis for such organizations can be had than the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society. There are thousands, we have no doubt, who would most gladly co-operate in such a movement, if a little trouble be taken to acquaint the people with its object, and the principles upon which it is to be conducted. Such societies should have their stated meetings which those who originate them should pledge themselves to attend, and use their influence to induce others to do so. The time has come when Abolitionists need rather to act *with* the mass of the people than upon them, as they have heretofore been obliged to do. The appeal should be made to them now to WORK, for for work we verily believe they are ready, rather than to convince them of the iniquity of Slavery, and the necessity for its abolition. Such an appeal, we believe, would not be in vain, and in what way can it be more effectually made than by presenting to them an organization in which they *can* work?

We wish that this subject might attract the attention which it deserves. It is by the organized efforts of Abolitionists that Slavery is to be abolished; the *unorganized* anti-slavery sentiment of the people will never do it. Abandon our societies, and in five years the cause would be where it was ten years ago. Multiply these societies, as they may be indefinitely, and in five years the cause will be where twenty years would not find it with no other instrumentalities than we now have. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." The slave will never gain his freedom unless his friends WILL WORK.

Charles C. Burleigh in Prison Again.

We mentioned in our last paper that Mr. Burleigh had been arrested, and in default of paying a fine, sentenced to six days' imprisonment in the Chester County jail. The fine, however, was paid by his friends, and he was released in the course of an hour or two after he arrived at the jail. In a letter in last week's Freeman, in which he gives a minute detail of all the particulars attending his arrest and trial, he announces his intention of returning on the following Sunday to Oxford to lecture, and as is usual with him on such occasions, to sell Anti-Slavery publications. The result of this visit—we presume it to be—is given in a private letter to a friend in this city, from which we are permitted to make an extract. He says:

"My work for the last two weeks has been made much harder by my being taken into the Commonwealth's keeping, and thereby losing the best part of three days from my regular course of labour, in being tried and sentenced, and then in taking a trip to prison, and after my release, getting back to my field of operations. I am now again in the County's strong house, on the same charge as before. My crime, as you may perhaps be aware, is 'doing good on the Sabbath days,' by selling Anti-Slavery publications. I was committed on the 16th, and arrived here [West Chester Jail] yesterday morning, sentenced to six days' imprisonment, and have now passed nearly two of them. For hours together I have been left here without watch or ward over me, and nothing but an unfastened door between me and the street, which leads me to think I am not regarded as a very dangerous prisoner, or one very likely to break jail. So far as any physical obstacles are concerned, I might have been in New-York or Boston by this [illegible]

We presume, from this letter, that the spirits of the prisoner are by no means affected by his being retained in "durance vile." Nor do we suppose that his jailor would by any means give himself up to despair, as jailers in such cases sometimes do, should his prisoner escape. Indeed, we have no doubt that he is exceedingly chagrined that his charge will not run away. Our friend, we suppose, as he says nothing to the contrary, is in comfortable quarters, and probably will not be obliged—as a prisoner in the Nantucket jail was once forced to do,—to inform the authorities that if they do not keep the sheep out he cannot stay. Mr. Burleigh, in his letter to the Freeman, says that the constable was unwilling to serve the first writ, and the jailer no less reluctant to relieve him. He proposed to the former to go alone to the prison with the commitment, but that functionary declined the offer because of the manifest impropriety of a man's taking himself to jail.

We confess that our sympathies are not very greatly excited for the persecuted authorities of Chester County. Mr. Burleigh, we trust, will continue to subject them to the annoyance of committing him under an absurd law, which is only brought to light to throw obstacles in the way of the Anti-Slavery cause. Valuable as his services are as a faithful labourer in the field of reform, he could not preach more effectually, or to a larger audience, than while sitting unwatched—or watched only in the hope of seeing him run—in the county jail of Chester County.

The "High Seat" in Dr. Patton's Church.

Our readers perhaps will remember the articles in this paper, on the church of the Rev. Dr. Patton of this city, which were published in July last, and the rejoinder of the Rev. Mr. Page, who was supplying Dr. Patton's pulpit during his attendance at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, in London. The facts stated, and the spirit in which they were replied to by Mr. Page, attracted a good deal of attention in England, and have been made good use of by Messrs. Thompson, Douglass, Wright, and others, in their lectures, in various places. The existence of the "Jim-Crow Pew," particularly, and the almost blasphemous manner in which it was referred to by Mr. Page, has been the subject of much comment. The existence of this "peculiar institution" of the American Church, is of course, well known to all who are in any way familiar with the manners and customs of the United States, but we are informed that many persons in England have doubted the truth of the statement, that so odious and unchristian a peculiarity really had a local habitation in the church of so respectable a divine,—and withal, one of the members of the Evangelical Alliance, who went without his dinner,—as the Rev. Dr. Patton. Such persons, of course, could not have seen the communication of Mr. Page, but had heard, or seen the fact stated, in some lecture or newspaper.

To test the truth of the statement, an Englishman and his wife, who have recently arrived in this city, visited Dr. Patton's church on Sunday last. Not satisfied with merely a sight of that seat, "a little towards Heaven," "at Dr. Patton's right hand, and near his heart," as Mr. Page said of it, they determined also to try its accommodations. On taking their seats, they were informed by the coloured people present, that the "pew" was for their exclusive use. These persons, of course, could

gation? It is not enough that the coloured people there should be set aside as a proscribed caste, though among them is one poor blind, old man, in whose behalf mere humanity should plead, but so accursed are they that no white man can be permitted even to come in contact with them if it be possible to prevent it. We wonder that the beadle was not ordered to force the fanatical Englishman and his wife to a decent observance of the customs of the country.

But, said the Rev. William Page, "they are seated just as the Son of God himself is seated, viz: on high, above the great congregation, in the eye of all, and by the right hand of his best friend." Did the reverend gentleman mean to say there is a "Jim-Crow Pew" in Heaven? or did he only mean that the "high seat" of Dr. Patton's church would have been good enough for the Son of God, with his dark, Jewish complexion, though too vile for the fair-haired Saxon race?

The Mighty "Differ."

We find in the Sunday Times the following paragraph:

The romance writers of this country know nothing about their *trade*, for such it is in the parent country of romance—France! Dumas was recently tried for a violation of a contract to furnish a newspaper with a romance. He defended himself, and in his address to the court stated that he could write *a volume in eight days*, and that he had been engaged in furnishing five romances to as many different newspapers at one time. He had been employed to write a novel for 20,000 francs. The novel was written, but he thought it inferior to his other works, and threw it into the fire. When will a literary man in this country be able to burn an amount equivalent to 20,000 francs?

Immediately following it, is another of a somewhat similar character. It makes all the difference with the editor of the Sunday paper—Mordecai Manassah Noah—whether a man lives in Paris or New-York. In the one case, it is Dumas, the Marquis de la Pailleterre, the noble author, and man of genius, who writes a volume eight days, and values his literary reputation more than money; in the other, it is the New-York "nigger," akin to the monkey; and who would rather gamble than work. Here is paragraph No. 2.

The coloured people's paper, entitled the "Ram's Horn," having censured a negro gambling amusement, called lottery policy-playing, has been taken to task severely by its subscribers, the greater number of whom indulge in this exciting sport. A correspondent thus talks to the sedate editor in his own columns.—"I want to know, sir, if there is anything started among coloured people that is not started by policy money? I know a great many that will not take the 'Ram's Horn' if you allow the policy player to be held up to scorn and contempt in it. Let us mind our own business, and I think we will get along better than to be finding fault with people because they gamble a little." Terse and spirited this. Yes, Mr. Ram's Horn, the negro would rather gamble than work; and if he can make anything by the former, be assured he will never trouble himself for the latter.

John Jay on Compensation.

The statement in our last, that "even John Jay defended compensation," is incorrect. We intended only to refer to his argument that Great Britain ought to pay the masters, as she *agreed* by treaty, 1783, for such slaves as took refuge within her lines during the war.—Secret Journals, 4. 278. We are glad to make the correction before any one has observed the error, for we would be the last to rob the best of our great men of one leaf of his well earned laurels.

We take occasion to add, also, that the *legal* authorities adduced in our first article, showing that Judges have no right to overrule wicked laws, were not intended for Mr. Spooner, as he distinctly admits (p. 62) it to be the settled doctrine of all Courts that they have no such power, but we enlarged on that point for the sake of others, who carry the principle farther than Mr. S. does, and imagine that Courts exercise such a power.—W. P.

Glasgow Emancipation Society.

We received among our foreign papers, by the steamer, a number of the Glasgow Argus, containing a full report of the Annual Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society. Judging from the frequency of the meetings of this body, and the earnestness and zeal with which it advocates the Anti-Slavery cause, it is, we presume, one of the most, if not *the* most, efficient auxiliary to the League, in Great Britain. Their resolutions are derstood among the Abolitionists of Glasgow as if they were on the immediate field of action.

We observe, by the Report of the Treasurer—Mr. Wm. Smeal—at the Annual Meeting, that the expenditure of the past year, has been something over $2,000, a proof of the activity of the Committee. They have printed many thousands of pamphlets, and distributed them, with thousands of newspapers, over the country.

Dr. Kidston presided at this meeting, and it was addressed by Messrs. John Murray, Wm. Smeal, the Rev. Fergus Ferguson, Dr. George Jeffrey, and others.

A series of resolutions were adopted condemnatory of the course of the Free Church of Scotland and the Evangelical Alliance, and commending the position taken by the British branch of the Alliance, and the formation of the Anti-Slavery League.

☞ THE NATIONAL ERA of last week complains of injustice done to the editor by the Liberator and other papers, in copying some remarks of his—when editor of the Cincinnati Herald—on the Mexican War. Our readers will remember that the article in question has been copied into the Standard. We give the explanation of the editor of the Era in his own words:

"While, however, we were publishing our first series of articles on the subject, we were informed that some misapprehended our course so far as to suppose us actuated by hostility to Gen. Taylor, or heartless indifference to his fate. *To correct this misapprehension alone*, we penned a few words of explanation hastily, without critically measuring our language, inserted them in the Daily we were then editing, and never thought of them again till, some months after, we found them paraded in a certain class of papers, to prove us a supporter of the Mexican war.

For ourself we have only to say that we were not aware what explanation had been made of the article in question. We certainly had no intention of doing injustice to the editor of the Era. The correction is cheerfully made, notwithstanding the uncourteous and sneering tone in which the complaint is preferred.

THE CAMPAIGN BEGAN.—Mr. Webster has announced his intention of making a tour of the Southern States this Spring. The North will give him leave to travel there for the rest of his days, if he shall look up to the April sun as he did to that of October four or five years since, in Virginia. We all may "live and learn," and Mr. Webster, though a wise man always, is wiser now than then.

☞ GERRIT SMITH has made a donation of $2,000 for the relief of the starving Irish. This is the largest sum that has been contributed by any one individual in this country. However much we may disagree with Mr. Smith as to our duty to the Anti-Slavery cause, we honour him as a conscientious and humane man.

MR. GARRISON announces, in the Liberator of last week, his intention to visit Ohio during the month of August next. He may be sure of receiving a most hearty welcome from a large number of people in that State, and his visit cannot but be productive of much good.

☞ A petition has been presented to the Massachusetts Legislature asking that the residences and names of all petitioners for the dissolution of the Union may be printed, "in order that the whole people may know how many, and who they are." This very small attempt to make political capital out of party prejudice, is made by Joshua Leavitt, S. E. Sewall, H. B. Stanton, J. C. Lovejoy, and other leading Liberty party men of Massachusetts. We are surprised that so honourable a man as Mr. Sewall, should lend his name to anything so contemptible.

PRICES CURRENT.—We have re-arranged the list of prices so that it will be, we trust, of more value to our country subscribers, and especially to those engaged in agriculture. Several of the tables in the list which we have hitherto published are omitted in this, and some others are added. The tables will be corrected weekly, as heretofore, and we hope they may be useful to the class for which they are intended. If our readers, however, can suggest any additions or corrections, we shall be glad to receive them.

☞ The friends of Frederick Douglass, in Bristol, England, have presented him with a silver ink-stand as a testimony of their regard for him, and their appreciation of the value of his labours in behalf of his enslaved countrymen. We hope when he returns home, the Collector of Boston will not oblige him to pay a duty upon it.

THE FLIGHT OF THE VULTURES.—The National Intelligencer states that immense flocks of vultures have been seen taking their flight Southward. Do they follow instinctively the lead of the American Eagle to the fields of Mexico?

DISUNION.—Petitions have been sent to the Massachusetts Legislature from forty-three towns, signed by 2,834 persons, 1,694 of whom are legal voters.

From our Boston Correspondent.

NO XV.

Cradles of Liberty, not one, but many.—Philosophical speculations as to the minority, and lawful discretion of Liberty, especially in the matter of Matrimony.—Her "rockers."—Old South Church a Cradle.—Growing sanctity of Meeting-Houses.—Punished by metamorphosis into a Riding School.—Ghost of Dr. Sewall.—Condition of the house.—Fourth of July Orations.—Tremont Temple.—Temptations of lucre of gain to destroy the Old South.—Wealth of the Church, which it is hoped will save it.—Recruiting station on Church land.—Exhibition of Fine Arts.—Signs of growing taste—Myers, Colt, Tirrell, and other public characters in enduring wax.—The Æsthetics of Murder and Hanging.—Hearing of Memorialists for secession of Massachusetts form Union.—Spacious apartment for the occasion.—Comparative importance of topics for legislative consideration.—Mr. Phillips's Argument.—Hon. George Lunt.—Mr. Garrison's Argument.—Number of Petitions.—Laura Bridgeman, and His Excellency.—Concerning blind guides and ditches.—Rev. Mr. McClure.—His discoveries from his Observatory.—The Pelagian Heresy at South Boston.—The Correspondent uttereth his holy horror thereat, and concludeth his epistle.

BOSTON, March 12, 1847.

Everybody who visits Boston goes to Faneuil Hall, as a matter of course, and goes through a certain amount of sentiment and sensation about the Cradle of Liberty, and all that sort of thing. This is all well enough. But Liberty had several cradles in those days of her infancy. I do n't know exactly when Liberty grew up. But she could hardly have attained to years of discretion, when she went and married herself to Slavery, her natural and hereditary enemy, as the best match she could make. I should think the marriage must be voidable on the ground of infancy at the time it was contracted. At any rate, she can make out a perfect case for a divorce, for abuse and ill treatment since it was formed. However, this is neither here nor there. We were talking of her cradles in the days when she had Sam. Adams and James Otis for what are called "rockers" in Queen Victoria's nursery.

One of her other cradles was the old South Church, which stands at the corner of Milk and Washington streets. Very many of the public meetings which "go up" the Revolution, were held there. For in those meeting-houses were not thought to be too good to be used. Anti-Slavery and Temperance have done much towards developing the latent sanctity of a good many sanctuaries, that used to be none too good for Town meetings, Militia elections, and Masonic celebrations. The British owed such a grudge to the Old South for the part it had played in the earlier stages of the Revolution, that at the time of the siege, they turned it into a Riding School for the use of the cavalry regiments stationed in a town like Boston, without rebuke. The Rev. Alexander McClure, Editor of the Christian Observatory, (which, for the better opportunity of observing all "wandering fires," he has set up next door to the Anti-Slavery Office,) has made a discovery which throws mine into the shade. Mine only related to practical morality, while his goes to the more vital point of theological heresy. What do you think he has discovered, that Dr. Howe has been instilling into the unprotected mind of Laura Bridgeman? *Pelagianism!* Yes, by the tongs of Saint Dunstan, PELAGIANISM!! Fie, fie, Dr. Howe! who would have thought it of you? Pelagianism, indeed!! Anything but that! D. Y.

Notes on New Books.

History of the Discovery and Settlement of the Valley of the Mississippi. by the three Great European Powers, Spain, France, and Great Britain, and the subsequent occupation and extension of civil Government by the United States, until the year 1846. By John W. Monette, M. P. 2 Vols. Harper & Brothers: 1846.

These handsome volumes are published at a most favourable moment, not only for their industrious author, but for the public, who are eager for information on the subject with which they are occupied. It is the first systematic attempt that has been made to give a complete history of a part of the United States which at this time, chiefly occupies the public mind. It was the object of the author to give a comprehensive but condensed narrative of American colonization west of the Alleghanies, and to connect the history of the French and Spanish colonies, with those of the Anglo-Americans in their advance upon the tributaries of the Ohio river. Dr Monette's map of the boundaries of Texas in 1836, and of the French and Spanish possessions in 1845, are in accordance with the universally acknowledged authorities, but widely at variance with the unfounded pretensions of Mr. Polk and his abettors.

Dr. Monette's work is a valuable addition to our historical literature, and will be of great service in enlightening the public mind on a subject of daily increasing interest.—R.

The Life of Napoleon Buonaparte. By William Hazlitt. New-York: Willey & Putnam: 1847. (Forming 6 parts of the Library of choice Reading)

Hazlitt's Napoleon has probably been less read than any other of his works. The prefatory remarks of the editor inform us that in his other works he wrote from necessity, but in this from choice. Undoubtedly he wrote from choice, because he chose his subject, but all who knew the qualities of his genius must have known his unfitness for the task he assumed. He was too honest, and had too hearty a hatred of tyranny and oppression to make a popular history of Napoleon. He admired him for his intellectual greatness, and because he was the opponent of the feeble men of his own nation, and not for those qualities which have made him the popular idol of the world. But his history is probably as honest a one as has been written of his subject, and we would prefer it to all others for the sake of the justice that is done in it to the vicious rhetorical flummery of Burke.

Mr. Burke, says Hazlitt, strewed the flowers of his rhetorie over the rotten carcass of corruption; by his tropes and figures so dazzled both the ignorant and the learned, that they could not distinguish the shades between liberty and licentiousness, between anarchy and despotism; proved that Slavery was a very chivalrous and liberal sentiment, that reason and prejudice were very much alike, that the Queen of France was a very beautiful vision, and that there was nothing so vile as useful knowledge and practical improvement."—R.

Harpers' Illuminated and Illustrated Shakspeare. Nos. 135, 136.

These two numbers complete this great undertaking. They contain a part of the life of Shakspeare, the Editor's preface, title pages to the three volumes, and the order of the plays. They are beautifully illustrated and printed in a manner that will compare with any edition of the great poet ever published in England or America. Taking this superb edition of Shakspeare as a whole, it reflects the highest credit upon the editor, Mr. Verplanck, upon the publishers, and upon Mr. Hewitt, who superintended and selected the subjects for engraving. It will unquestionably be placed at the head of all the editions of Shakspeare ever published, by every discriminating critic and Shakspearian student. With the edition of Payne, Collier, Knight, and Singen to select from, and the entire youth of Art which England has recently lavished on the illustration of her great Poet at the command of the engraver, could not well have been otherwise.—R.

The Castle of Ehrenstein. By G. P. R. James. Harper & Brothers.

There is more vigorous writing in this novel, than in any other by the same author that we have ever looked into. Mr. James has either greatly improved, or he has engaged the services of a new assistant, for there is evidently a fresh hand at the bellows somewhere.—R.

The Harpers have also recently published new editions of the following works:

D'Israeli's Sketches of English Literature, in 2 Vols. The Life of Columbus. By Irving. Abridged by the author.

Directions for invigorating and prolonging life, by Dr. Kitchener, revised and improved by J. S. Barrett; and A System of Intellectual Philosophy, by Asa Mahan.

To Correspondents.

J. P. R. The paper is sent from this office as a gratuity. His faithful and arduous labours are understood and fully appreciated.

R. D. H. His letter did not reach us till too late to comply with his request at the time appointed. It will be attended to before this reaches him.

G. B. will receive a letter by mail.

W. P. We never thought of such a thing. Depend upon it, nobody would suspect him of it.

J. T. The honesty of his friend need not be doubted. The matter is now cleared up.

This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry:* Lines suggested by the well-known words of Mr. Jefferson; The Sword; Let's Make It Up. *Miscellany:* A Shoemaker's Notion of the Feet; Hachisch; Evangelical Alliance; A Short Examination Whether War is Lawful for a Christian; Lines on the Death of a Friend's Child; Treating Error with Ridicule; A Negro Priest; Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

FIFTH PAGE.—*Communications:* Letter from Jonathan Walker; Cazenovia Anti-Slavery Convention, (continued); Letter from W. W. Brown.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

Late from Europe.

The Hibernia arrived at Boston on Saturday, with London and Liverpool dates to the 3d and 4th.

There is a further advance in the provision market.

The distress in Ireland is still the absorbing topic of the papers. There seems to be no amelioration of the famine.

The British Government have taken a loan from the Barings, and the Rothschilds of £8,000,000. The Irish drain on the Exchequer is more than a million a month.

Mr. O'Connell is said to be dying.

A great meeting has been held in London to protest against the division of Cracow.

A day of fasting and humiliation is to be appointed by her Majesty, in consideration of the dreadful condition of

Mr. Everett, the American Minister to China, has been received with distinction by the Chinese Government.

News from Mexico.

The news from the seat of war the past week has excited intense interest. Intelligence has been received by way of St. Louis from Santa Fé, that the conquered town of Taos had been retaken by its rightful owners—the Mexicans. This the sovereigns of the United States denominate an INSURRECTION, meaning, we suppose, that as the section of country had been embraced within the area of Freedom, it had become slave territory, and of course any attempt there, to regain their liberties, on the part of the people, becomes an insurrection within the meanin of the Constitution of the United States. In this attempt of the Mexicans to retake one of their own towns, a number of Americans were killed. This, in the report, is denominated a *massacre*.

The interest and indignation excited by the successful attempt of the Mexicans to drive the invaders from Taos, has been swallowed up, however, in news from General Taylor and his army. All that is certain is that a great battle has been fought at Saltillo, between the Mexican forces, under Santa Anna himself, and the Americans under General Taylor. The latter had with him 5,000 men, 2,000 of whom are reported to have been killed. The Mexican force is represented as being much larger, but on these first reports no reliance is to be placed. They have heretofore proved universally false, and we do not generally come far from the truth by multiplying the reported American loss by 2, and dividing the Mexican by the same number.

The fact seems now to be that not a single considerable Mexican town remains in the hands of the Americans except Monterey, and that General Taylor and his force are shut up in that, surrounded by the Mexican army. We sincerely trust the marauders will be driven this side the Rio Grande.

The Government has ordered the volunteers raised under the Ten Regiment Bill, to repair immediately to the scene of action. They amount to between one and two hundred men. It is suggested that the officers appointed under the Bill, amounting to about 400, be enrolled as privates, and marched to Mexico. There is reason to fear, however, that the war-spirit will be revived by this reverse of the American arms, and still more blood will be wasted in this piratical attempt to rob a neighbour of her territory, to spread the curse of human Slavery,

A large body of Mexicans is reported as about to attack Matamoras General Taylor has made a requisition upon Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Alabama, for ten regiments of troops, but all communication with him, at the last accounts, is cut off.

General Items.

It was resolved, a few evenings ago at a public meeting in Brooklyn, to raise fifty thousand dollars for the erection of an observatory.

On removing some rubbish recently in the district of the great fire of the summer of 1845, the fire was found to be still alive!

Capt. Peabody, of the brig Eagle, from Pernambuco, February 12th, brings a report that an insurrection of the negroes of Munseria had just reached that place. A Brazillian man-of-war had been sent down to assist the whites.

Calvin Ross, whose sentence to death for the murder of his wife has been commuted to imprisonment for life, was taken to Sing Sing last week.

A meeting of women has been called in Philadelphia to form an association for the reclamation of females from the paths of degradation, by proffering them a home, employment, and education.

Professor Mitchell said, in his lecture the other evening, that the power of Lord Ross' telescope is so great that it would show to the human eye a star the light of which would be three millions of years in reaching the earth.

The Irish Relief Committee of this city have expended eighty-five thousand dollars, and have just chartered their fifth ship. They despatched three vessels laden with corn and meal on Friday last.

Shocking Depravity.—The Academy of Medicine of this city has impeached Dr. W. W. Minor, of Williamsburgh, for the heinous crime of holding a consultation with a homeopathic physician!

One thousand nine hundred and ten buildings were erected in this city in 1846.

A man in New Hampshire changed the hour of his wife's funeral from 3, P. M. to 8, A. M. that he and his son might go to town meeting.

Fifty thousand dollars has been subscribed for the permanent endowment of the University of Vermont.

The people of Halifax have contributed over two thousand two hundred dollars for the relief of Ireland and Scotland. The Montreal Hibernian Benevolent Society have given one thousand dollars.

General Convention of the States.—In the Massachusetts House of Representatives, last week, Mr. Capen, of Boston, submitted an order that the Committee on Slavery and the Mexican War consider and report on the expediency of a General Convention of the States, equal in number to the Congressional Representation, to consider the subject of indemnifying such slaveholders as may be disposed to abolish Slavery, and to appoint a time after which every child born of slave parents shall be free, to deliberate on measures for properly and constitutionally abolishing Slavery, and to devise decisive measures for the speedy termination of the Mexican War. Laid over. Subsequently, the order of Mr. Capen was taken up and rejected.—*Liberator.*

A Literary Negro.—At a recent Presbyterian Synod, held at Watumpka, Ala. a negro named Ellis was admitted to the ministry. He is to be sent as a missionary to Liberia. The Enfaula Shield says his wife and children have been purchased by the Presbyterian Church, at a cost of $2,500. He has acquired his education by his own exertions, and upon examination proves himself a good Latin, Greek, and Hebrew scholar, but better versed in Greek. His examination in theology is highly satisfactory.—*Alb. Eve. Journal.*

We are pleased to see from the following, which we find in the Ledger, that the coloured people are coming up to the work of relieving the suffering in Ireland. This is creditable to them; a noble generosity is one of their characteristics:

At a meeting of the coloured citizens of the Northern Liberties and Kensington, held pursuant to public notice given on Friday evening, the 12th instant, Charles Davis was called to the chair, when the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:

Whereas, an afflicting calamity has befallen the people of Ireland and Scotland, and hundreds are starving to death for the want of the commonest food, and we believing it right to sympathise with and assist our fellowmen of all climes and countries, therefore be it

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed to collect and receive such contributions as may be made.

Resolved, That all contributions when collected be forwarded to Frederick Douglass, now travelling in Ireland and Scotland, and we recommend all contributions made by the coloured people of this country to be forwarded to him, to be distributed at his discretion.

Isaac W. Rigas, James Hollowell, Francis Faucet, John Dixon, and Moses Davis were appointed the committee, in accordance with the first resolution.

CHARLES DAVIS, *Pres.*

CYRUS BURRIS, *Sec.*

A similar movement, we understand, has been made by the coloured people in the southern part of the city.

The compliment paid to Frederick Douglass by the meeting, in making him the almoner of their bounty, is happily conceived.—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*

Died,

At Mount Pleasant, on the 14th instant, Mrs. CORNELIA BEEKMAN, relict of Gerard G. Beekman, and daughter of Pierre Van Courtland, formerly Lieutenant Governor of this State, in the 96th year of her age.

On Friday, 19th instant, GILBERT J. MCCOUN, son of Wm. T. McCoun, aged 32 years.

In Ashburnham, Mass. March 1, Mrs. HANNAH HILL, mother of ex-Governor Hill, of New Hampshire, aged 75

In Cambridge, March 13th, FRANCIS W., son of the late Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood, D. D. aged 21.

In Philadelphia, on Tuesday, the 16th instant, aged 23 years, HELEN MARIA, wife of Ellis Yarnall, and daughter of Samuel Cox.

At her residence at Williamsport, Pa. on Thursday, March 11, suddenly, Mrs. ANNA BARBARA MCELRATH, (mother of one of the publishers of The Tribune,) at the advanced age of 75 years.

On the 10th of 2d month last, at the residence of her brother-in-law, John C. Cox, Quincy, Illinois, SALLY ROWLAND, daughter of the late Joseph G. Rowland.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For Standard—from March 12th to 20th 1847.

John S. Davis, Hunt's X Roads, Ia.	$1 00
Jabez Wilbar, East Rush, N. Y.	3 00
Nathan Grove, Richmond, Ia.	1 00
Elizabeth Willets, North Hempstead, N. Y.	1 00
A. P. Converse, Hartwick Seminary, "	1 00
Samuel Huntington, Middlefield Centre, N.Y.	1 00
Elisha Hayden, do. do.	1 00
Joseph Gould, West Walworth, N. Y.	1 00
John Ferris, Waterloo, N. Y.	1 00
John Hughes, West Winfield, N. Y.	1 00
Wendell Phillips, Boston, Mass.	1 00
George W. Green, Dedham, Mass.	1 00
Rev. J. C. Phillips, Methuen, Mass.	1 00
Rev. R. S. Stoors, Brooklyn, N. Y.	1 00
John H. Farnsworth, Dana, Mass.	1 00
David Wyman, Westminster, Mass.	1 00
	18 00
Total Amount,	$18 00

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

NOTICES.

FAST DAY.

WINDHAM COUNTY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Annual meeting of the Windham County Anti-Slavery Society will be held at Brooklyn on Friday, April 2d, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. and continuing through the day. Samuel May, of Massachusetts, and other interesting speakers will address the meeting. It is earnestly desired that all who feel for the oppressed, or regard the rights of man should attend. The meeting, as usual, will be free to the remarks of all, whether friends or foes.

In behalf of the society,

GEORGE SHARPE, *Pres't.*

LUCIAN BURLEIGH, *Sec.*

ANNIVERSARY IN MAY.

The friends of the abolition of Capital Punishment throughout the United States, are earnestly requested to be represented at the meeting of the New-York State Society, to be held in this city on Monday, May the 10th. Among the speakers expected to address this meeting, are Hon. Robert Rantoul, Wendell Phillips, John Pierpont, Horace Greeley, Rev. E. H. Chapin, Charles C. Burleigh, Parke Godwin, J. L. O'Sullivan, Rev. W. H. Channing, and Prof. Patterson, of Philadelphia.

JOSIAH HOPPER, Sec. W. T. McCOUN, Pres.

☞ Papers friendly, please copy.

FAIR COMMITTEE.

At a meeting of the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society, held March 11th, 1847, the following persons were appointed a Committee on the Fair, to be held at the close of the year:

Mary T. Stickney,	Margaretta Forten,
Anna M. Hopper,	Mary Grew,
Emma Parker,	Mary Shaw,
A. Matilda Cassey,	Esther Reckless,
Janette Jackson,	Sarah Pugh,
Maria M. Davis,	Clementine Green,
Margaret Griscom,	Elizabeth Carman,
Martha Carman,	Sarah M. Douglass,
Harriet D. Purvis,	Esther Hogeland,
Hannah L. Stickney,	Esther Burr,
Emily Winslow,	Lydia Gillingham,
Theresa K. Hallowell,	Sarah L. Child,
Paulina S. Wright,	Gertrude K. Burleigh,
Sarah A. McKim,	Huldah Justice,
Eliza J. Bias,	Margaret Jones.

MEETINGS FOR C. L. REMOND AND J. C. HATHAWAY.

SENECA COUNTY.

Ovid, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, March 17, 18, and 19.
Farmersville, Saturday and Sunday, March 20 and 21.
Lodi, Monday and Tuesday, March 22 and 23.
Covert, Wednesday and Thursday, March 24 and 25.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Trumansburg, Friday and Saturday, March 26 and 27.
Ulysses, Sunday and Monday March 28 and 29.
Enfield, Tuesday and Wednesday, March 30 and 31.
Reynoldsville, Thursday and Friday, April 1 and 2.
Hector, Saturday and Sunday, April 3 and 4.
Burdette, Monday and Tuesday, April 5 and 6.

CHEMUNG COUNTY.

Catharines, Wednesday and Thursday, April 7 and 8.
Milport, Friday and Saturday, April 9 and 10.
Horse Heads, Sunday and Monday, April 11 and 12.
Elmira, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 13 14 and 15.

TOMPKINS COUNTY.

Ludlowville, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 19, 20, and 21.

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six o'clock, P. M. J. C. HATHAWAY.
3d mo. 9, 1847.

MEETINGS.

W. W. Brown and Dr. Hudson will join each other on Tuesday, March 16th, and thereafter hold meetings in conjunction, as follows. The friends of the slave in the different places will not forget to anticipate their arrival, and make all the necessary arrangements for the meetings.

Litchfield, Wednesday, March	17th
Frankfort, Thursday and Friday,	18th and 19th
Mohawk, Saturday and Sunday,	20th and 21st
Herkirmer, Monday and Tuesday,	22d and 23d
Little Falls, Wed. and Thursday,	24th and 25th
Fairfield, Friday and Saturday,	26th and 27th
Middleville, Sunday,	28th
Newville, Monday and Tuesday,	29th and 30th
St. Johnsville, Wed. & Thur. March,	31st and April 1st.
Palatine, Frid. and Saturday, April,	2d and 3d
Fort Plain, Sunday and Monday,	4th and 5th
Johnstown, Tuesday and Wednesday,	6th and 7th
Mayfield, Thursday and Friday,	8th and 9th
Amsterdam, Saturday and Sunday,	10th and 11th
Schenectady, Monday and Tuesday,	12th and 13th
Albany, Wednesday and Thursday,	14th and 15th

Meetings to commence at one and half-past six, P. M.
Farmington, 2d mo. 11, 1847.
J. C. HATHAWAY, Gen. Agt. for N. Y.

ANTI-SLAVERY LEAGUE.

Tickets of membership may be obtained at 142 Nassau St. price 25 cts. Friends from the country wishing tickets, to constitute themselves and any of their friends members of the League, may obtain them by remitting the money and names with the residence of each, when the tickets properly filled up, will be forwarded to them by mail.

The Anti-Slavery League is an Association formed in London, of which George Thompson, Esq. is President, and which is intended to include all, in all parts of the world, who can adopt the PRINCIPLE of the League, which is thus expressed on the ticket:

"Slaveholding, under all conceivable circumstances, is a heinous sin, and ought to be immediately abandoned."

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.

Duty, 20 per ct ad val. per 100lbs.	
Pots, 1st sort 1846	7 4.81½ a 4.87½
Pearl	5.25 a 6.31½

BEESWAX.

Duty: 20 per cent. ad val.

Cuba, white per lb	—.— a —.—
American, yellow,	—.27 a —.—

BRISTLES.

Duty, 5 per cent ad val.

St.Pet'sbg, 1st sort lb.	.90 a 1.12½
do. 2d sort	.35 a .45
Okatkh, gray&white	1.90 a 1.95
Souchoy	60 a .65
American	55 a .60

COAL

Duty, 20 per cent. ad val.

Liverpool, Orrel. chal	7.00 a 7.12½
Newcastle, coarse	6.00 a 6.12½
Scotch	6.00 a 6.50
Sidney and Pictou	6.00 a 6.38
Anthracite, 2,000lbs	6.00 a 6.50

DOMESTICS.

Shirtings, brown 3-4 yd	5 a 6
do. do. 7-8	— a —
do. bleached	6 a 8
do. S. I. do.'	7 a 11
Sheetings, brown 4-4	7 a 8½
do. do. 5-4	10 a 12
do. bleached 4-4	8 a 12
do. do. 5-4	12 a 15
Calicoes, blue	9 a 12
do. fancy	7 a 15
Plaids	9 a 11
Kentucky jeans,	15 a 30
Satinetts	25 a 60
Checks 4-4	8 a 10
Cotton Osnb. S. No. 1	— a 9
do. No. 2	— a 8
Cotton yarns, 8 a 13	16 a 19
do. 14 a 19	18 a 22
do. 20 a 23	22 a 23

FLOUR & MEAL.

Duty, 20 per cent ad val.

Genesee per bbl.	6.87½ a 7.00
Troy	— a —
Michigan	6.93¾ a 7.00
Ohio, flat hoop	6 93¾ a 7.00
Ohio round hoop	—.— a —.—
Ohio, via, N O	—.— a —.—
Pennsylvania	6.87½ a 7.00
Brandywine	6.62½ a —.—
Georgetown	6.6 a —.—
Baltimore c. mills	6.50 a —.—
Richmond c. mills	8.00 a 8.50
do. country	6.75 a —.—
Alexandria	6.50 a —.—
Fredericksburg	6.50 a —.—
Petersburg	6.50 a —.—
Rye flour	4.87½ a 5.00
Cornmeal, Jersey	3.00 a 3.12½
do. hhd.	22.50 a —.—

FISH

Duty, 20 per cent ad val.

Dry cod, cwt.	3.62½ a 3.75
Dry scale	1.75 a 2.00
Pickled cod, bbl.	3.00 a —.—
do. salmon, tce	16.50 a 17.00
Smoked do. lb	— a —
Mackerel, 1, bbl.	10.00 a 10.50
do. No. 2	—.— a —.—
do. No. 3	—.— a —.—
do. do. North	6 75 a 7.25
do. No. 3 South	5.00 a 5.25
do. do. North	4.75 a —.—
Shad, Ct. hf.bbl. N	4.75 a —.—
do. No. 2	4.37½ a 4.62½
Buckap't. bbl.	—.— a —.—
Mass. do.	—.— a —.—
Southern	—.— a —.—
Herring, pickled	3.50 a 3.75
do. scale, per box,	85 a 90
do. No. 1	55 a 60
do. No. 2	30 a 35

GRAIN.

Duty, 20 per cent. ad val.

Wheat, white bush	1.40 a 1.50
do Western	1.— a 1.30
do. Southern	—.— a —.—
Rye northern	.90 a .92
Corn north'n & Jer	.81 a .92
do south'n (weight)	85 a .92
do N O & West'n	—.— a —.—
Barley, Western,	75 a .80
Oats, northern	48 a .50
do. southern	42 a .45
do. New-Jersey	42 a .45
Beans, white	1.56 a 1.62½
Peas, blk eyed,	—.— a —.—

FLAX

Duty: 15 per cent. ad val.

Russia per lb.	9 a 8
American	7 a 11

FEATHERS

Duty: 25 per cent. ad val.

Foreign per lb.	12 a 25
Foreign A. A.	25 a —
Live, American	28 a 32

HAY—Per 100 lbs.

North River in bales	58 a 60

HOPS

Duty, 20 per cent. ad val.

First sort 1846, lb.	9 a 11

LEATHER. [Sole]

Duty, 20 per cent. ad val.

Oak per lb.	17 a 22
Oak Ohio,	16 a 20
Hemlock, light	15 a 16
do. middle	15 a 16
do. heavy	13 a 14½
do. damaged	12 a 13
do. poor do.	7 a 9

LIME

Thomaston per bbl	88 a 87½

LUMBER

Duty: Timber and firewood, 20; boards, timber, &c. shaped for use, 30; do rough, 20 per ct ad val. Yard selling prices

Timber w. pine pr.c.ft.	13 a 20
do. east'n scant or beams prM. ft.	15.00 a 16.25
do oak, cn. ft.	.22 a .33
do. Gr. Isl. W.O.	—25 a —25
do. O.scnt.pr.M.ft.	30.00 a 35.00
do. Ga.yel.pine (by cargo) per cub. ft.	—24 a —26
Plank Ga. yel. pine pr M foot	27.50 a — —
Boards N.R.M.ft.cl.	30.00 a 35.00
do. 2d ql.	20.00 a 25.00
do. Box	14.00 a 14.50
Albany, piece	10 a .15
Plank Alb. pine	12 a .22
Lathe E. by car.	2.25 a 2.50
Shingles bd. 18 in.	1.75 a 2.00
do. Ced.Bd.1stql.	2.00 a —.—
do. do. 2d ql.	22.— a 24.—
do. 2dLst ql.	17.— a 18.—
do. do.2dql.	15.— a 16.—
do. Cyprus 2d ql.	13.— a 14.—
Heading W.O.pr.M.	45.— a 50.—
Staves W. O. pipe	50.— a —.—
do. do. hhd.	40.— a —.—
do. do. bbl.	30.— a —.—
do. R. O. hhd.	29.— a 30.—

PROVISIONS.

Duty: Cheese 30; all other 20 per cent. ad val.

Beef, mess per bbl.	11.— a 12.—
do. prime	8.50 a 9.25
Pork, mess Ohio	14.37½ a 14.50
do. prime do.	12.— a 12.25
Lard	9½ a —.10½
Hams, smoked	10 a —.11
Shoulders, smoked	7½ a —.8
Beef, do.	9 a —.10
Butter, Orange co.	20 a —.22
do. West'n dairy	14 a —.16
do. country	a —
Cheese	7 a —.7½

SEEDS.

Duty: flaxseed clover, and timothy, 20 per cent. ad val.

Clover, per lb.	— a — 8½
Timothy, 7 bush.	17.— a 22.—
Flax, rough	—.— a 11.50
do. clean	—.— a —.—

TALLOW.

Duty: tallow grease, & soap stuff 10 per cent. ad val.

Rendered	8½ a 9

WOOL.

Du

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

LINES,

Suggested by the well known words of Mr. Jefferson,

BY JAMES STILLMAN.

I tremble for my country,
I know that God is just,
And though His vengeance long delays,
Descend at last it must;
The cry of the oppressed ascends;
The hopeless sufferers cry,
And the voice of blood and guilt is gone
Up to the throne on high.

I tremble for my country,
I hear the clanking chain,
The whip's dull stroke, the piercing shriek
Of agonizing pain;
The groan of deep despair that bursts
When ruthless ruffians sever
Husband, or mother, wife or child,
To meet no more forever!

I tremble for my country,
I loathe the filthy spot,
That stains her glorious banner with
A foul and damning blot;
That record of her shame, which stands
To every eye confest,
And makes her to a sneering world,
A by-word and a jest.

I tremble for my country,
She boasts herself to be
The refuge of the oppress'd, and home
Of those that would be free;
Boasts her religion, and her laws,
Yet wickedly retains
Three million of her children, bound
In Slavery's heaviest chains.

I tremble for my country,
I see her borders spread,
I witness Freedom's onward march,
And hear her legions tread;
Yet every added mile that gives
To Freedom wider scope,
Throws but new barriers round, to blast
The wretched bondman's hope.

I tremble for my country,
Dark shadows gather round,
And the threat'ning storm is mutt'ring forth
A sad and fearful sound;
O! when the spirit form of wrath
Shall forth in fury ride,
What mortal voice shall bid it stay?
What head in safety bide?

I tremble for my country,
I may not live to see
The shafts of justice round me fall,
Or share the penalty;
Yet, O, my country not the less
For thee my spirit yearns,
And o'er thy fast approaching doom
With bitter anguish mourns.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE SWORD.

I.

The Prophet of the Lord hath said,
That in the Gospel days,
The sword a ploughshare shall be made—
Jehovah's be the praise.

II.

His house, above the mountain's peak,
Shall shine with light divine,
And gath'ring nations there shall seek,
His ways and paths to find.

III.

The Lord shall guard them by his grace,
And fast their steps increase,
Pleasant and pure are all His ways,
And "all His paths are peace."

IV.

The early saints these truths *believed*,
And sealed them with their blood,
Refused the weapon—and achieved
A martyr's crown, with God.

V.

But now the world is full of Hate,
And War, and Slavery, and Wrong:
At Moloch's beck, the mean and great
Bow down—a num'rous throng.

VI.

And some, O, Lord, will have it so,
Some who Thy name profess;
Hast not Thou, Lord, pronounced a wo
'Gainst those, who man oppress?

VII.

Lord, who hath dimm'd thy Zion's mount?
Hinder'd its rays divine?
Who, covered o'er the sacred fount
Open'd by thee for sin?

VIII.

It is, O Lord, the veil of sin,
That hides thy beauteous face;
Help us to break the captive's chain,
And 'mancipate a race.

IX.

Then, shall our light like morning beams
Burst on the nations far;
While myriad voices join in hymns,
And praise Jehovah Jah.

X.

O, Lord, thy spirit on us pour,
And let thy Kingdom come;
Let "dearest charity" have power,
As in thy heav'nly home. M.

From the London Inquirer.

"LET 'S MAKE IT UP."

BY CHARLOTTE YOUNG.

Homely words may we deem them,—the season has flown
When we heard them from others, or made them our own;
Yet, would that their spirit of sweetness and truth
Could come to our ears as it came in our youth;
Oh! would that we uttered as freely as then,
"Let 's make it up, brother, smile kindly again.
Let 's make it up."

Let us make it up, brother; Oh, when we were young
No pride stayed the words ere they fell from the tongue;
No storms of dissension, no passions that strove,
Could banish forever the peace-making dove.
If 'twas frighted awhile from its haven of rest,
It returned at the sound that would please it the best,—
"Let 's make it up."

Let us make it up, brother, Oh, let us forget
How it is that so coldly of late we have met;
Where the fault may be resting we 'll stay not to tell—
Its curse on the spirits of both of us fell;
So take my hand firmly, and grasp as of yore,
Let heart whisper to heart as they whispered before,—
"Let 's make it up."

Miscellany.

From Chambers's Journal.

A SHOEMAKER'S NOTIONS OF THE FEET.

In going up Regent street one day in Summer, three years ago, in quest of a shoemaker, we had the good fortune—for good fortune it is—to fall in with exactly the kind of man we wanted: this was Mr. James Sparkes Hall, a person who, to much sound sense on general subjects, unites the rare skill of supplying shoes so nice, easy, and pliant, that the feet, after years of torture, are very much surprised to find themselves unexpectedly in such an earthly paradise. On conversing with this clever member of the gentle craft, we learned that he was the inventor of the *paniscorium*—a material externally resembling leather, but possessing all the softness and pliancy of cloth. Pleased with the appearance of this novel fabric, we procured some articles made from it, and having tested them by long and diligent wear, called a short time ago at Regent street to renew the supply. On this second occasion Mr. Hall mentioned that he was engaged on a work on the feet, including a history of boots and shoes, such, he thought, being very desirable in the present state of knowledge on the subject. We thought so too. Mr. Hall has accordingly brought out this production, the result, he says, of long professional study.

"The Book of the Feet," as the author styles his work, is a plainly but pleasingly written volume, and exhibits, within a small compass, the various forms and phases which the coverings of the feet have assumed from the time of Egyptian sandals down to this current era of Wellingtons, Bluchers, Clarences, Cambridges and Alberts. Of course much of this matter can be rendered intelligible only by the aid of engravings; but the reader may take our word for it, that in no department of dress has fashion more indulged her whims and caprices than in boots and shoes. At one time these were made so long in our own country that Edward IV. had to enact sumptuary laws to restrain the length of toe to a couple of inches; at another, they were fashioned so broad that Mary had to decree a statutory breadth of six inches; in the days of Venetian glory, the ladies wore heels so high, that they could not walk unless between a couple of attendants; and at present, the shoes of the Chinese belles are so Lilliputian that it has been gravely asserted that they have no feet at all. Nor are *we* yet without our fashionable absurdities: high heels and narrow soles are the bane of the living generation, creating pain and expense, and converting the free, elastic, natural gait of the "human form divine" into a stilted and unseemly wriggle. Let us hear Mr. Hall—and he is a practical authority—on this really humane and important subject:

"For upward of twenty years, as a bootmaker, I have made the feet my study, and during that period many thousand pairs of feet have received my attention. I have observed with minute care the *cast* from the antique as well as the 'modern instances,' and am obliged to admit that much of the pain I have witnessed, much of the distortion of the toes, the corns on the top of the feet, the bunion on the side, the callosities beneath, and the growing in of the nails between, are attributable to the shoemaker. The feet, with proper treatment, might be as free from disease and pain as the hands: their structure and adaptation to the wants and comfort of man being naturally perfect. Thirty-six bones and thirty-six joints have been given by the Creator to form one of these members, and yet man cramps, cabins, and confines his beautiful arrangement of one hundred and forty-four bones and joints—together with muscles, elastic cartilage, lubricating oily fluid, veins and arteries—into a pair of shoes or boots, which, instead of protecting from injury, produce the most painful as well as permanent results. Many volumes have been written on the cause of corns, and it has been my lot to wade through many of them without gaining much for my pains. I have therefore arrived at the conclusion, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, that *corns are in all cases the result of pressure.* I am confirmed in this opinion by one of the most respectable chiropedists of the present day—M. Durlacher, a gentleman who has had considerable experience in the treatment of corns and bunions. He says:

"Pressure and ... posing causes of corns, although in some instances ... are erroneously supposed to be hereditary. Improperly made shoes invariably produce pressure upon the integuments of the toes and prominent parts of the feet; to which is opposed a corresponding resistance from the bone immediately beneath, in consequence of which the vessels of the dermis are compressed between them, become injured, congested, and in a short time hypertrophied."

"When corns are produced by friction and slight pressure, they are the result of the shoes being too large and the leather hard, so that, by the extension of the foot, the little toe, or any prominent part, is constantly being rubbed and compressed by its own action. This may continue on and off for months, or even years, before any inconvenience is experienced, but, progressively, the cuticle increases, and is either detached from the dermis by serum being poured out between them, similar to a common blister, and a new covering produced, or the epidermis thickens into layers adhering to each other."

Admitting, then, that pressure and friction are the causes of corns and other grievances of the feet, the only permanent remedy—for extraction is a mere temporary palliative—must be the removal of the cause by wearing a sufficiently large and well-fitting shoe.

"Every one," continues Mr. Hall, "who has corns, knows and feels that pressure is the cause—no one knows better where the shoe pinches than he who wears it. Yet few persons know why it hurts, or are aware how the remedy should be applied. Sometimes a shoe is too large, often too small, very often too short, but generally the wrong shape altogether. The fault lies not so much in the shoes themselves, as in the lasts from which they are made: there the cause is to be found, and there it has been my study for many years to apply the remedy. The best material may have been used for sole and upper-leather; the most exquisite closing and stabbing been put in, till the work 'looked like print;' the workmanship may have been 'first rate,' but deficient in the primary and most essential part—the suitable form of the last on which the article was to be moulded—the boot or shoe would not be a suitable or comfortable covering for the foot, and the unfortunate wearer finds that he has put his feet into 'shoemaker's stocks.' *Every one who wishes to be comfortably fitted, should have a pair of lasts made expressly for his own use.* Experience has taught me, and doubtless many other masters who have had much to do with bespoke work for tender or peculiar feet, that no plan is equal to this to secure a good fit, and save inconvenience, and disappointment for the future. The length and width are now every day affairs, but the judgment of fitting is another thing; and here is the true skill."

"A last fitted up to the length and width may do, or it may not. It may do by chance, or fail of necessity; but if fitting be anything, it is a skillful adaptation of the last to the true form and requirements of the foot generally. Many persons have an idea that right and left shoes are comparative modern innovations of fashion; but this is a mistake—straight lasts are a modern invention, and, notwithstanding what many persons say to the contrary, are decidedly inferior to a well formed right-and-left pair. The great evil has been that all right-and-left lasts of late have been *crooked.* It was thought that, in abandoning the straight last with all its faults, a perfect fit could be secured in rights-and-lefts; and from one extreme, as is generally the case in fashion, the opposite was adopted, and a twisted right-and-left made the matter still worse. It was thought nothing could be right-and-left but that which took a decided turn; and the consequence has been, that for years lasts have been made with an ugly twist inward, where no wood was required; and on the outside, where the toes, with all their tenderness and liability to injury, have required thickness and breadth, nothing has been left. I have pointed out this fault to last-makers a thousand times; have stood by them at their work, and have seen the part, where I wished of all things the room to be left, cruelly sliced off, or rasped away; the consequence to the unfortunate wearer of a shoe or boot made on that last necessarily being—months of torture."

To remedy all this, Mr. Hall advises an outline of the feet to be traced on paper, the other dimensions to be properly taken, the prominent toes and other protuberances to be noted down at the time, and immediately after a pair of lasts made suitable in every way; or what would, perhaps, be still better, a cast of the foot in plaster of Paris to be handed over to the last-maker.

"In this way, he continues, "ladies and gentlemen, and even children, should have their own lasts. It would, however, be expecting too much that, for a single pair of shoes or boots, a shoemaker or bootmaker should make for his customer a pair of lasts free of charge. As prices are now, he would be a considerable loser; the customer might never favour him with another order; he seeks a cheaper shop, goes abroad or dies. The lasts on which a skilful workman has been employed for perhaps a whole day, and which cost at least four or five shillings, are left on his hands perfectly useless. For my own personal comfort, I would weigh my own lasts, which have been carefully made, in a scale against their weight in silver, and consider them cheap; numbers of our nobility and gentry, in effect, do the same, and to a much greater amount, for their personal comfort in matters of the teeth, eyes, chest, hair, hands and ears. Then why not a little sacrifice, a little more liberality to those important members—the feet? No such remuneration, however, as I have hinted at would be expected; five or six shillings, generally, would remunerate the maker of a pair of lasts, and these would serve a grown-up person for his lifetime."

This is really sound and valuable advice; and no one who studies his own comfort—for there is nothing more fretting and distressful than ill-fitting shoes—will for a moment hesitate to adopt it. Let every one who can afford it have lasts made to the form and configuration of his own feet; let them be his own property; and let him carry them with him, to be used wherever he may happen to reside. Nor are 'high heels' less to be avoided than crocked lasts; they throw the weight of the body on the parts least able to sustain it—the toes; beside bending the knee, and destroying that straightness and command of limb which, in the human figure, is so indicative of strength and grace. Were these counsels followed, would the votaries of fashion but forego their absurdities and adhere a little more closely to nature and common sense, we perfectly concur with our author that the feet might be as exempt from pain and disease as the hand, and that an article of dress, now so frequently a torture, would become at once the preserver of health and minister of comfort.

*THE BOOK OF THE FEET; A *History of boots and shoes*, with illustrations. By James Sparkes Hall, Patent Elastic Bootmaker to her Majesty, &c. London: Simpkin & Marshall. 1846.

HACHISCH.

Those who have read Dumas' Count of Monte Christo, will be interested in the following extract from an article on Dr. Moreau's Psychological Studies, in the British and Foreign Medical Review:

"Hachisch is the Oriental name of the plant which is scientifically known as the *cannabis indica*, and in our own vernacular as the Indian hemp; of which the extract has been lately used in this country as a sedative, narcotic, and antispasmodic. In the East, however, it is rather valued on account of its power of producing a species of intoxication, whose peculiar character we shall presently analyse; and it is used for this purpose among the Arabs, as extensively as opium among the Turks and Chinese, and alcoholic liquors among the European nations. The most common preparation of Hachisch,—that which forms the foundation of all others, is a sort of fatty extract; this is prepared by boiling the leaves and the flowers of the plant with water to which a certain quantity of fresh butter has been added; the decoction is reduced by evaporation, to the consistence of a syrup, and is then strained through a cloth. The butter thus becomes charged with the active principle, and acquires a greenish hue; its taste is very disagreeable, and hence it is seldom taken alone, but is mixed with other confections and aromatics, so as to form a sort of electuary. The one in most common use is termed by the Arabs, *dawamesc;* but this is frequently mingled with substances of reputed aphrodisiac virtues, to enable it to minister more effectually to the grossly sensual purposes which seem to be the great object of life among many of the Orientals. The leaves of the Indian hemp may be smoked with tobacco: and when freshly gathered they have a rapid and energetic action.

"There seems little doubt that the effects of the hachisch have been known from a very remote antiquity. The plant is very common in the centre and west of Asia, growing without any cultivation; and its peculiar properties, therefore, would be easily discovered. ... ingenious mankind have been in finding out means of inebriating themselves. The spontaneous fermentation of saccharine juices probably furnished the first intoxicating beverage; and we find in the oldest history of our race, that the postdiluvian patriarchs were occasionally overcome with wine, in a manner which renders it probable that drunkenness was one of the vices of the antediluvian nations. At the present time we have, as is well known, an immense variety of these alcoholic beverages, some produced by the simple fermentation of expressed vegetable juices, whilst in others the art of stillation is employed for their concentration; some again being prepared from saccharine matters artificially produced, as in the process of malting; and one (as far as we know a solitary instance) being obtained from an animal secretion,—the Tartars, who are cut off from all ordinary sources of alcoholic supply, managing to obtain a spirituous liquor which they term *koumiss*, from the milk of their mare, which is well known to be peculiarly rich in saccharine matter, whilst correspondingly poor in butter. Then again, in the tropical portion of the Old World, we have the opium and the Indian hemp, and the tobacco in the New; whilst among some of the nations of Siberia, whose inhospitable climate will neither bring these productions to perfection, nor supply the means of obtaining alcoholic drinks, we find an extraordinary kind of intoxication induced by an agariciform fungus, the *amanita muscaria.*"

EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

A correspondent of the London Inquirer, happily hits off a class of American clergymen, unfortunately a very large one,—so large, indeed, that a delegation taken indiscriminately from the clerical profession, could not fail to give it a full representation. We wish that nothing worse even could be said of them than that they are vulgar, vain, and empty coxcombs. All this they are in an eminent degree, as a class:

SIR:—One way of arriving at the qualities of bodies is by analysing the materials of which they are composed. The following is an extract from a letter, written by a gentleman who recently crossed from London to New-York, and it contains a minute analysis of some of the constituent ingredients of a distinguished religious association, which may perhaps furnish useful information to some of the credulous simpletons in England. It may be premised that the writer is a surgeon of nearly fifty years' standing, and the son of a clergyman.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

F.

"Our passengers, on the whole, a disagreeable party. There were eight clergymen on board—six Methodists and two Presbyterians. They were members of a deputation, chosen and sent out from America, to meet a convention of evangelical clergy, from all parts, and of all opinions, in London, to form what they were pleased to term an Evangelical Alliance; but for what purpose, or to what end, I could not understand. All I know is, that America, in all its regions, mustered one hundred, of which these were a portion, returning to their several residences in different parts of the continent. They constituted a bad specimen of their class and order,—vulgar, noisy, coarse in manners, boasting, proud, and exclusive. They herded together, confined their conversation to professional subjects,—if so they may be termed,—played at shuffle-board on the deck when the weather permitted, or at draughts in the cabin. They found out a silly boy, or hobadihoy, among the passengers, whom they eagerly converted into a standing joke, speedily and diligently made him the fool or jester of their party, and laughed loud and long at the folly and nonsense they extracted from him. One thing was very remarkable, that religion with these men, was the standing subject for their jokes. They were, on the whole, the most profane set of men I ever met with, setting aside swearing, drinking, and absolute ribaldry. They sought for, and revelled in, a joke derived from some religious practice or opinion. The boy-fool was a follower of the opinions of Swedenborg. This was enough; they questioned him, extracted from him the nonsense he had been taught, quoted Scripture as it regarded the most exalted doctrines and dogmas, to extract laughter from his absurd replies. I am not very severe myself in these matters, but the practice of these men, calling themselves ministers of religion, disgusted, if it did not shock me. Their characters may be thus summed up,—they were coarse feeders, vulgar jesters, loud laughers, great boasters, incessant talkers, rough in manner, proud and independent in bearing, exclusive and deficient in common courtesy."

From the Phoenixville Pioneer.

EDITORS:—I wrote the following, in the year 1813 on the eve of my leaving home for some months. In my absence twenty thousand copies, in pamphlet form, were printed by Friends for distribution.

Meeting with a copy, a few days ago, I send it to you for insertion in the Pioneer if you please, as it may find its way into other papers, and so be extensively circulated.

If the doctrine it inculcates is not sound, it may be refuted;—but if "War be unlawful for Christians," professors of religion and their teachers ought not to believe and teach the contrary.

From your friend,
EMMOR KIMBER.

Kimberton, 2d mo. 3d, 1847.

A SHORT EXAMINATION WHETHER WAR IS LAWFUL FOR A CHRISTIAN.

BY EMMOR KIMBER.

[*Written and first published in 1813.*]

When we have considered the numerous religious societies, that are denominated Christian; when we have reflected upon the disagreement or difference in matters of faith and practice that exists among them; it is peculiarly grateful to return and contemplate those great and fundamental truths of the Gospel *in which all do unite*, and *all approve.*

Of this kind is our belief in the scriptures, and our hope in Christ Jesus. We have all one common hope of salvation: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."—Acts iv. 12.

How consistent with the most tender regard, and with the most cordial affection we are capable of feeling towards one another, is the language of Christ to his disciples: "One is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren!"—Mat. xxiii, 8. And again, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another:" John xiii, 34. And as he thus designed that his disciples, that is, *that Christians*, should be one great family of love, he makes it their distinguishing mark. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another:" John xiii, 35, but as men whose hearts are full of strife and contention, may be said at times "to love those that love them," the love of Christians, the real follower of Christ, was not to be so confined; "But I say unto you," says Christ, "*love your enemies*, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your father who is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust."—Mat. v. 44, 45.

For the preservation of brotherly love amongst the believers, the apostle inculcates the most tender regard, and in order that their various *conscientious persuasions* might occasion no interruption to their respective services in promulgating the Gospel of peace and salvation, he refers the decision in such cases to the Lord Almighty alone: "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth."—Romans xiv. 4. But under the extensive latitude of Christian charity and it a disposition of the most unlimited toleration of the consciences of others, it behoves the sincere minded to examine and see that their own sentiments and practices correspond with the scriptures, and the doctrines of the Gospel; for "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth."—Romans xiv. 22.

When we consider that the earth is filled with violence, that every nation is preparing for *war*, or engaged in actual hostilities; when we consider again, that the policy of the world requires that we should cherish those dispositions, and acquire that dexterity and skill which shall render us efficient and powerful in the work of death; when we reflect upon the horrors, the miseries, the crimes of war, that thousands and millions of our fellow-creatures have been cut off, in the midst of their days, and sent fresh from the strife of battle, burning of a just God! When we reflect upon this wretched state of human nature, in producing or suffering the calamities of *war*, we are naturally led to enquire, "Is there no remedy? Does there exist no power on earth, or in Heaven, to arrest them? To this I answer, most assuredly there is; it were injurious to say there is not. There is a power in the religion of Jesus Christ, which reconciles men unto God, and one unto another. There are thousands of living witnesses, who can ... the heart of its ... violence, and inculcates a disposition that can suffer for its sake. It teaches to return good for evil, to love enemies, and that man in all situations should be the friend of man. The reign, therefore, of the Messiah, the Prince of Peace, has commenced in the hearts that have thus received him, and they can join in the song of the heavenly host, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth, peace and good will towards men."—Luke ii. 14.

In these then is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, "And they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn *war* any more.—Isaiah ii. 4.

But as there are diversities of opinion on this subject, I propose briefly to examine, *whether war can at all be lawful for a christian.*

Some say war is certainly lawful, and consistent with the Christian religion because all Christian countries are in the practice of making war upon one another; for, if it were unlawful to Christians, how then could Christian countries be at war?

First, then, there is no such thing as a Christian country. It is a relative term, by which we understand, that the profession of the Christian religion obtains, or is generally the profession of its inhabitants. In this way, the word Christendom is intended to express all those countries taken together; nothing, therefore, can be drawn in support of the lawfulness of war, from the practice of these countries.

And here I might bring forward the concurring testimony of history, and the opinions of writers in the two first centuries, which would go to prove that Christians who lived nearest to the time of the apostles, held war to be unlawful to a Christian. They not only declined voluntarily to enter into armies, but when compelled by the arm of intolerance and despotism, they plead their religion as the ground of their refusal, and willingly sealed their testimony with their blood. This, however, will not be necessary to my purpose, for we have the authority of the Scriptures in the case; and the authority of the Scriptures no Christian can deny.

We have all one common hope of salvation; we believe there is no other name given under Heaven whereby we can be saved, but by the name of Jesus: Let us then *hear Him* on the subject.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also:"—Mat. v. 38, 39. But to war and to fight, even for our own defence, is to resist evil: *Therefore war is unlawful for a Christian.*

Again. In the prayer which the Lord Jesus taught his disciples, we are instructed to ask forgiveness as we forgive every one that trespasses against us; and to enforce the absolute necessity of forgiveness, he declared, "If ye do not forgive, neither will your Father which is in Heaven forgive your trespasses."—Mark, xi. 26. But war is exactly contrary to the forgiving of trespasses: *Therefore war is unlawful for a Christian.*

Again. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy: But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."—Mat. v. 43, 44. But no man in the spirit or practice of war can love his enemies; he cannot bless them or do them good when he seeks to destroy them from off the face of the earth: *Therefore war is unlawful for a Christian.*

I might extend this inquiry to the size of the New Testament itself, which abounds in precept and doctrines in opposition to the spirit of war; from all which it is evident that if the same mind be in us that was in Christ, we cannot seek to destroy men's lives, but to save them; and Scripture testimony is decisive, that, "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—Rom. viii. 9.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the mere profession of the Christian religion can redeem from the spirit of war. The profession alone can do nothing towards producing a change of heart. It is an easy thing indeed to take upon ourselves the name of Christ, to submit to, and even to be zealous for the outward forms and ceremonies of religion, and all this in a carnal mind. But to put on Christ, to *know Him* to be our Saviour and Redeemer is the experience of a Christian, and is the only way to rest and peace, in this world and in that which is to come; while it will ever remain to be true, that "to be carnally minded is death," let our profession be what it may.

And again. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.—John xvii. 3. But how shall we know that we know him? "Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments: He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him; but whoso keepeth his words, in him verily is the love of God perfected; thereby know we that we are in him."—I. John ii. 3, 4, 5.

The Apostle James in his Epistle "to the twelve tribes that are scattered abroad," among whom there were few who had embraced the Christian religion, and who were influenced by the spirit that breathes peace on earth and good will to men; asks them these questions: From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?"—iv. 5. He also declares to them, "If ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish."—iii. 14, 15.

From all which it is evident, that war proceeds from the evil in man, and that, according to the precepts and doctrines of Jesus Christ, wars and fightings are unlawful for Christians.

A friend sends us these lines which we publish, notwithstanding our poetry column was full when they were received. They will be read with deep, though melancholy, interest by the many friends and admirers of the author. They appeared originally in the Democratic Review:

ON THE DEATH OF A FRIEND'S CHILD.

BY J. R. LOWELL.

Death never came so nigh to me before,
Nor showed me his mild face: Oft I had mused
Of calm and peace and deep forgetfulness,
Of folded hands, closed eyes, and heart at rest,
And slumber sound beneath a flowery turf,
Of faults forgotten, and an inner place
Kept sacred for us in the heart of friends;
But these were idle fancies, satisfied
With the mere husk of this great Mystery,
And dwelling in the outward shows of things.
Heaven is not mounted to on wings of dreams,
Nor doth the unthankful happiness of youth
Aim thitherward, but floats from bloom to bloom,
With earth's warm patch of sunshine well content:
'Tis sorrow builds the shining ladder up
Whose golden rounds are our calamities,
Whereon our firm feet planting, nearer God
The spirit climbs, and hath its eyes unsealed.

True is it that Death's face seems stern and cold,
When he is sent to summon those we love,
But all God's angels come to us disguised;
Sorrow and sickness, poverty and death,
One after other lift their frowning masks,
And we behold the seraph's face beneath,
All radiant with the glory and the calm
Of having looked upon the smile of God.
With every anguish of our earthly past
The spirit's sight grows clearer; this was meant
When Jesus touched the blind man's lids with clay.
Life is the jailor, Death the angel sent
To draw the unwilling bolts and set us free.
He flings not ope the ivory gate of Rest,—
Only the fallen spirit knocks at that,—
But to benigner regions beckons us,
To destinies of more rewarded toil.

In the hushed chamber, sitting by the dead,
It grates on us to hear the flood of life
Whirl rustling onward, senseless of our loss.
The bee hums on; around the blossomed vine
Whirrs the light humming-bird; the cricket chirps;
The locust's shrill alarum stings the ear;
Hard by, the cock shouts lustily; from farm to farm,
His cheery brothers, telling of the sun,
Answer, till far away the joyance dies;
We never knew before how God had filled
The summer air with happy living sounds;
All round us seems an overplus of life,
And yet the one dear heart lies cold and still.
It is most strange, when the great Miracle
Hath for our sakes been done; when we have had
Our inwardest experience of God,
When with his presence still the room expands,
And is awed after him, that naught is changed,
That Nature's face looks unacknowledging.
And the ... as ever,
'Tis hard at first to see it all aright;
In vain Faith blows her trump to summon back
Her scattered troop; yet, through the clouded glass
Of our own bitter tears, we learn to look
Undazzled on the kindness of God's face;
Earth is too dark, and Heaven alone shines through.

How changed, dear friend, are thy part and thy child's!
He bends above *thy* cradle now, or holds
His warning finger out to be thy guide;
Thou art the nurstling now; he watches thee
Slow learning, one by one, the secret things
Which are to him used sights of every day;
He smiles to see thy wondering glances con
The grass and pebbles of the spirit-world,
To thee miraculous; and he will teach
Thy knees their due observances of prayer.

Children are God's apostles, day by day,
Sent forth to preach of love, and hope, and peace;
Nor hath thy babe his mission left undone.
To me, at least, his going hence hath given
Serener thoughts and nearer to the skies,
And opened a new fountain in my heart
For thee, my friend, and all: and oh, if Death
More near approaches, meditates, and clasps
Even now some dearer, more reluctant hand,
God, strengthen thou my faith, that I may see
That 'tis thine angel who, with loving haste,
Unto the service of the inner shrine
Doth waken thy beloved with a kiss!

CAMBRIDGE, Mass. Sept. 3d, 1844.

TREATING ERROR WITH RIDICULE.

"Indeed, reverend Sirs," says Pascal, in addressing the Jesuits, "there is a vast difference between laughing at religion and laughing at those who profane it by their extravagant opinions. It were impiety to be wanting in respect for the verities which the Spirit of God has revealed; but it were no less impiety of another sort to be wanting in contempt for the falsities which the spirit of man opposes to them. For, fathers, since you will force me into this argument, I beseech you to consider, that just in proportion as Christian truths are worthy of love and respect, the contrary errors must deserve hatred and contempt; there being two things in the truth of our religion,—a divine beauty that renders them lovely, and a sacred majesty that renders them venerable; and two things also about errors,—an impiety that makes them horrible, and an impertinence that renders them ridiculous. For these reasons, while the saints have ever cherished towards the truth the two-fold sentiment of love and fear,—the whole of their wisdom being comprised between fear, which is its beginning, and love, which is its end,—they have at the same time entertained towards error the two-fold feelings of hatred and contempt, and their zeal has been at once employed to repel by force of reasoning the malace of the wicked, and to chastise, by the aid of ridicule, their extravagance and folly. Do not then expect, fathers, to make people believe that it is unworthy of a Christian to treat error with derision. Nothing is easier than to convince all who were not aware of it before, that this practice is perfectly just,—that it is common with the fathers of the Church, and that it is sanctioned by Scripture, by the example of the best of saints, and even by that of God himself."

A NEGRO PRIEST.—A Manual composed by the celebrated Abbé Gregoire, for his "children of colour," and which published at his own expense some thirty or forty years ago at Paris, was decorated with the portraits of some half dozen black saints. The following paragraph from the "Moniteur Parisien," shows that in France colour is no bar to ordination:

"A negro, Abbé Mousse, who was ordained six years ago, will this day celebrated a solemn Grand Mass, and preach a sermon at the church of the Petits Pères. This is a subject of great interest to us, and we think it worthy the attention of the public to see one of those men whom the colonists treat as beasts of the field, speak from the Evangelical pulpit in the centre of the civilized world."

Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

ROGERS AND CHANTREY.—THE BARD AND THE SCULPTOR.—In the breakfast-room of Mr. Rogers, in his house in St. James' Place, stands a mahogany pillar or pedestal, about three feet high, on which a vase is usually placed, and which is ornamented with carvings very ingeniously done, and evidently executed by the hand of an artist of no small skill. It happened about twenty-five years ago that Chantrey, the sculptor, was one morning breakfasting with Rogers, when the latter, seeing the eye of his guest directed towards this pillar, took occasion to mention the ornamental part of it as the work of an unpretending but ingenious carver in wood, whom he had employed to do it about twenty years before. "And do you not remember the name of the artist?" asked Chantrey. Rogers replied, that from the time which had elapsed, he should not be able to recall either his name or his person to recollection. Chantrey then informed him, no doubt much to his surprise, that it was he himself who had executed these ornaments, before he entered upon his career as sculptor; when, we have heard, Sir Francis was in the habit of executing carvings in wood for any one who might employ him.—*Church of England Journal.*

THE BEAUTY OF PEACE.—When Capt. Back went to the Polar regions, in search of Capt. Ross, he fell in with a band of Esquimaux, who had never seen a white man. The Chief raised his spear to hurl it at the stranger's head; but when Capt. Back approached calmly and unarmed, the spear dropped, and the rude savage gladly welcomed the brother man, who had trusted in him. Had Capt. Back adopted the usual maxim that it is necessary to carry arms in such emergencies, he would probably have occasioned his own death, and that of his companions.—*British Friend.*

A PEASANT, with sickle or scythe, seeking work, is an honest, honourable object. He would assist, however humbly, in the great work of this working world. He goes "amid the alien corn," and he reaps the food, necessary to man. He is a worthy son of toil, and truly fulfils his mission.

A gentleman with a sword to let—with so much cold steel to rip, and gash, and stab withal—is, we think, another sort of person. He works in a very different field; and his labour—hireling as he is of blood—brings in another sort of harvest. A soldier of fortune, a mere day-worker in the field of glory—letting himself out to a foreign master, to do devil's mischief upon his fellow-creatures—is, in our opinion, a CAIN in uniform upon so much a day.—*Jerrold.*

When Sir William Hamilton announced to the Royal Irish Academy Professor's Madler's discovery of the central sun, the star round which our orb of day and his planetary attendants revolve, a waggish member exclaimed, "What! our sun's sun? why that *must* be a *grand son.*"

It is said that there is always a light in the King of the French's sleeping room, and that two pistols are placed on a table near his bed.

WRETCHEDNESS OF HINDOO WIDOWS.—An incalculable and unutterable amount of wretchedness is produced by the Hindoo law, which condemns the female to perpetual widowhood on the death of her husband. This is the case, even where the preliminary ceremony of betrothment only has taken place. Not only is absolute and unending widowhood imperatively commanded, but she is required to practise the most rigorous austerities, and to mortify herself as it were unto death. "The widow shall never exceed one meal a day, nor sleep on a bed." She is required to observe a rigid fast every eleventh day, besides many other seasons of abstinence. She is forbidden to taste animal food of any kind; and even the one meal of pulse, roots, and vegetables, that is allowed her, must consist of such articles as can be cooked together in one pot, to make up a single dish.—*Indian Examiner.*

DEAD MAN'S WILL.—I can tell you of a fancy that some people have in the wilder parts of Craven, that if the mark of a dead person (the body, however, not being cold) be put to a will, it is valid in law. A few years ago a case of this nature occurred. A farmer had omitted to make his will. He died; and before the body was cold a will was prepared by some relative (of course in his own favour), and a mark purporting to be that of the deceased, was made by putting the pen into the hand of the dead man, and so making his mark to the will. The body of the man was not then cold. The will was contested by some parties, and I believe, proceeded to a trial at law, when the circumstance ... —*Yorkshire Gazette.*

MEN OF MANY WIVES.—There exists in Bengal a particular class of Brahmins known by the name of Kulins, who are notorious for the number of their marriages. One member of this caste has been known to have formed three hundred matrimonial alliances, and to have had wives scattered over a vast extent of country.—*Indian Examiner.*

ENERGY.—A man with knowledge but without energy is a house furnished but not inhabited; a man with energy but no knowledge, a house dwelt in but unfurnished.—*Crystals from a Cavern.*

M. MICHELET.—The death of M. Michelet, announced lately in most of the papers, was not that of the historian, but of his father.—*Globe.*

Dr. Fascale, a chemist at Westeras, in Sweden, has announced to the Academy of Sciences at Stockholm, his discovery of a process of preserving flowers in their natural condition. He sent, it is stated, some roses, which he assures the Academy were prepared by him in 1844, and which have still all the appearance of being freshly gathered.

Dr. Baudeloque has communicated to the French Academy of Sciences, that by a new surgical treatment he had restored audition, and the elements of speech to a deaf and dumb boy nine years old.

LAW AND PHYSIC.—When Dr. H. and sergent A. were walking arm in arm, a wag said to a friend—"These two are just equal to one highway man." "Why?" was the response. "Because," rejoined the wag, "it is a lawyer and a doctor—your *money or your life.*

All Paris, says a correspondent of the *Pharmaceutical Times*, may be compared to an ever-fuming camphor kettle. Old and young, rich and poor, everybody of every degree, smoking camphor cigars.

Miss Lee, late of Kensington House, has bequeathed different sums to several charitable institutions, as well as 3s. 6d. a week for the support of a spaniel, and £10 a year for that of parrot.

R. W. EMERSON, OF CONCORD, MASSACHUSETTS, U. S.—We have seen a letter, received yesterday by the Cambria, from Mr. Emerson, addressed to a friend in Manchester, in which he alludes to the possibility of an early visit to this country.—*Manchester Examiner.*

The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Albion*, attributes a rise in the price of coffins, to Morrison's having advertised his Eternity pills at a prodigious rate.

A drop or two of honey well rubbed on the hands while wet, after washing with soap, prevents chapping, and removes the roughness of the skin; it is particularly pleasant for children's hands and faces in cold weather.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

CYRUS M. BURLEIGH, Plainfield, Ct
CHARLES ATKINSON, Marion, Grant co Ia
J. MILLER M'KIM, Philadelphia, Pa
AMARANCY PAINE, Providence, R I
PLINY SEXTON, Palmyra, "
J. C. HATHAWAY, Farmington, Ontario co N Y
THOMAS MCCLINTOCK, Waterloo, "
SLOCOMB HOWL